



BS

2397

.S3313

1882

CLARK'S
FOREIGN
THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY.

FOURTH SERIES.

VOL. XXVII.

Schmid's Biblical Theology of the New Testament.

EDINBURGH:
T. & T. CLARK, 38, GEORGE STREET.

MDCCCLXXXII.

PRINTED BY MORRISON AND GIBB,

FOR

T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH.

LONDON, HAMILTON, ADAMS, AND CO.

DUBLIN, GEORGE HERBERT.

NEW YORK, SCRIBNER AND WELFORD.

BIBLICAL THEOLOGY

OF

THE NEW TESTAMENT.

BY

CHRISTIAN FRIEDRICH SCHMID, D.D.,

LATE PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY, TÜBINGEN.

TRANSLATED FROM THE FOURTH GERMAN EDITION, EDITED BY
C. WEIZÄCKER, D.D.,

BY

G. H. VENABLES.

THIRD EDITION.

EDINBURGH:

T. & T. CLARK, 38, GEORGE STREET.

MDCCCLXXXII.

CONTENTS.



| | PAGE |
|-------------------------|------|
| INTRODUCTION, | 1 |

FIRST PART.

| | |
|------------------------------|----|
| THE MESSIANIC AGE, | 15 |
|------------------------------|----|

FIRST DIVISION.

| | |
|---|----|
| THE LIFE OF JESUS, | 25 |
| I. The Early History of Jesus, | 25 |
| II. Christ's Preparation for, and Entrance upon, His Public Ministry, | 39 |
| III. The Public Career of Jesus, | 51 |
| IV. The Conclusion of His earthly Ministry, | 81 |

SECOND DIVISION.

| | |
|--|-----|
| THE TEACHING OF JESUS, | 90 |
| I. The Glorification of the Father in the Son, | 93 |
| God the Father, | 93 |
| The Son, | 107 |
| The Spirit, | 145 |
| Father, Son, and Spirit, | 161 |
| II. The Redemption of Man, | 170 |
| III. The Kingdom of God, | 242 |

SECOND PART.

| | PAGE |
|------------------------------|------|
| THE APOSTOLIC AGE, | 270 |

FIRST DIVISION.

| | |
|---|-----|
| THE LIFE OF THE APOSTLES, | 273 |
| I. The Apostolic Life, | 274 |
| II. The Development of the Apostolical Community, | 291 |
| III. The Commencement of Outward Action in the Apostolic Community, | 316 |

SECOND DIVISION.

| | |
|--|-----|
| THE TEACHING OF THE APOSTLES, | 323 |
| I. The First Fundamental Form of the various Apostolical Systems of Teaching; or, Christianity considered in its Unity with the Old Testament. | |
| 1. The Apostolical Teaching of James, | 338 |
| 2. The Apostolical Teaching of Peter, | 374 |
| II. The Second Form of Apostolical Teaching; or, Christianity in its Distinction from the Old Testament. | |
| 1. Apostolical Teaching according to Paul, | 417 |
| 2. The Apostolical Teaching of John, | 519 |

BIBLICAL THEOLOGY

OF

THE NEW TESTAMENT.

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. *New Testament Theology.*



OUR subject is the Christian religion as we find it distinctly laid down in the New Testament Scriptures. Hence it follows that it treats only of such parts of the Bible as relate to the Christian religion; and especially, that opinions, either non-religious or non-Christian,—those peculiar to the Jews for instance,—which are occasionally mentioned, concern us here only so far as they tend to throw light upon Christianity. We are bound, moreover, in the treatment of our subject, to adhere closely to the stamp set upon Christianity in the New Testament in opposition to more modern theories, except where these may help to elucidate the former. Our science embraces the New Testament dogmas and morality, consequently the whole of Christianity as contained in the New Testament. We claim for it the title of an historical exposition, as it at once accepts the Christianity of the New Testament as a matter of fact, and as such seeks to investigate it and to set forth its gradual development. The term Biblical Theology, however, is hardly precise enough, because it does not sufficiently distinguish between our science and either exegesis or systematic theology. But if for the name adopted we were to substitute Biblical Dogmatics, then on the one hand a confusion might readily arise between our science and systematic theology, and on the other hand the term is too narrow, because our subject is not confined to mere dogma. As regards its relation to other branches of theology, our science must be looked upon as only a

part of biblical theology generally ; for biblical theology deals with both the Old and New Testament, and therefore sets forth religion as laid down in the whole Bible. But on account of the great distinction, both external and internal, between these two essentially different stages of development and forms of biblical religion, it is more convenient to keep them separate ; and the more so, as every attempt to discuss them together sets their real divergence in a clearer light. Our subject stands, therefore, in a close relation to exegesis, both being concerned with the investigation of the Scriptures. Its aim is to reproduce the thoughts therein expressed, taking the statements of Scripture as its basis. But the exegetical function which it performs is of the highest and most advanced kind. For exposition is at its lowest stage when it deduces a doctrine from the interpretation of an isolated precept : it is a stage more advanced when it ascertains the sense and purport of whole books and sections ; or, out of several doctrinal passages which treat of the same subject, by comparison and looking at them as a whole, develops the precise ideas and dogmas which they contain. The third and highest stage is reached when it ascertains the ideas and doctrines conveyed by a whole body of didactic discourses and passages, by taking a comprehensive view of its different portions in their relation to each other. It is not, however, contented with isolated ideas and propositions, but taking an aggregate of doctrinal ideas and dogmas, it presents both their unity and their variety in a life-like doctrinal whole, which at the same time exhibits the systems of thought as distinguished by their organic gradation. This is precisely the province of biblical theology, and is the point to which exegetic theology, if conscious of its vocation, is always tending, and the result in which it is summed up. The relation in which our science stands to systematic theology is somewhat different. Biblical theology has been frequently understood to mean nothing else than a certain kind of positive divinity, which, without regard to ecclesiastical interpretations, is founded mainly upon the New Testament alone. But although its aim certainly is a systematic summary of its subject-matter, yet it is essentially distinct from the above-mentioned dogmatics by reason of its historical character. It is still further removed from ecclesiastical, speculative, or descriptive dogmatic. It is nevertheless allied to dogmatic and all systematic theology, in so far as this

is based upon New Testament Christianity and presupposes the question, What it is.

The historical character of our science connects it with historical theology generally ; but it is not identical with church history, because the subject of the latter is the founding of the church, and the establishment of rules for its guidance in all time to come.

Although the absolute interest of our science depends upon its place in the organism, so to speak, of the theological sciences, yet by the circumstances and wants of the age, it is peculiarly enhanced both in an historico-critical and a dogmatic point of view. If the living development of Christianity is to be comprehended, above all things it is necessary for the living germ to be clearly perceived ; and to this end an historical investigation of primitive Christianity is needful. The greater the difficulty which, through the inquiries of criticism, surrounds this task, the more important does it become to represent faithfully the scope of the original records, and especially of the doctrinal systems founded upon them ; for by so doing we shall obtain the firmest grasp even of the critical questions involved in the New Testament. Take for example the question of the gospel narratives. Attention has of late been chiefly directed, especially by Strauss, to the external historical purport of the gospels, and the conflict on this point has lasted for many years. It will, therefore, be well to throw additional light upon the critical question from the side of the doctrinal element contained in the gospels, and by giving the greatest prominence to this element, to carry on the discussion with more calmness and candour than have hitherto marked it. A careful development of our Lord's teaching will enable us to form a judgment as to the relation between the Synoptists and St. John as regards His doctrines, be the difference small or great between them. We shall also be able to compare the teaching ascribed by the evangelists to Jesus, with that contained in the other books of the New Testament known to us as apostolical. The result will, moreover, help us to solve the question, whether the doctrine of Jesus, as transmitted to us by the evangelists, really bears the same relation to the apostolical doctrine of the other New Testament writers as the foundation does to a finished building ; or whether no such distinction is shown, and it is therefore possible that what the evangelists

ascribe to Jesus Himself as His own teaching, is in truth nothing but the doctrine of the apostles. We shall arrive at some noteworthy results on both these questions. With regard to the latter, it will be shown that what is handed down to us as the teaching of Jesus is in fact of a nature calculated to serve as the foundation of all other doctrine; and that the apostolical teaching in the rest of the New Testament writings is obviously the offshoot and development of this. In the didactic discourses of Jesus we have the pregnant germ and kernel, the root, and the simple yet solid groundwork: in the apostolical doctrine, as presented in the other New Testament scriptures, we have the shoots and branches, the plant developed from the germ, the finished building resting on that simple but firm foundation. The precepts of our Lord in the gospels claim our acceptance as original, pregnant, and bearing the first impression of the mould in which they were cast; and the apostolical doctrine appears to be no less living and life-giving,—both being in accordance, the latter with the circumstances of its further development, the former with the personal details of our Lord's life on earth. But as touching the relation between John and the Synoptists, it will be seen, unless we allow ourselves to be misled by mere form, how, notwithstanding all differences, essential unity underlies them; and that the form itself, even in its manifold diversity, furnishes the key to its own solution.

Modern criticism has recognised only four of St. Paul's epistles as genuine, chiefly on the ground that the later epistles do not agree in doctrine with the earlier. New Testament theology will therefore analyze and compare the doctrine of the earlier and later epistles on the points of alleged disagreement. Consequently, this part of New Testament theology will be found to aid us materially in deciding upon the genuineness of the later epistles. The two epistles of St. Peter have been also attacked and represented as an imitation of St. Paul, by which the later followers of St. Peter were to be persuaded that the teaching of the two apostles was identical. We shall presently inquire whether the doctrines of these epistles, especially of the first, are only an aggregate of Pauline and Judaistic elements, or whether, on the contrary, an independent system of doctrine is not contained in them. In like manner the doctrinal statements in the epistle of St. James are of great importance.

The interest of our science with regard to systematic theology is, however, peculiarly enhanced by the need of a higher use of Scripture, which need has shown itself generally in the development of systematic theology, and especially in the increased cultivation of its ideal and speculative elements. Systematic theology has, indeed, at times made very light of referring its views to Holy Scripture, especially to our Lord's teaching in the New Testament. For, on the one hand, it has been thought justifiable to take for granted a general acknowledgment of the identity between what is commonly understood as theological system with the New Testament in general, and Christ's precepts in particular; and, on the other, it has sometimes been regarded as of little moment whether this agreement was acknowledged or not, and whether, therefore, the truths which systematic theology asserted were known to be drawn from other than scriptural sources. The result of this has been, that the exegetical function of systematic theology was often very unsatisfactorily performed. The same may also be said of most methods of treatment even in modern times, especially those which deal with the subject from its speculative side, in which theology is taught as a speculative system supported merely by a few quotations from Scripture. But even where attention was paid to the exegetical function of systematic theology, the difficulty to be encountered is proportionately greater; for so many things had to be taken into account, and the subject-matter was so varied and intricate, that it often appeared necessary to limit the exegetical function as much as possible, in order that the scientific statement might not be too much drawn out.

Nothing is gained, however, for systematic theology by such treatment. In its very nature it stands essentially related to Christianity as laid down in the New Testament Scriptures, it must draw its material from this source, and, whatever scientific form it may assume, prove the identity of its doctrine with biblical Christianity. In this alone is presented the divine revelation,—Christianity itself, indeed, in its original depth and purity, attested by authentic documents and with the demonstration of the Spirit and of power. No treatment, therefore, can be satisfactory, there can be no true reform and remodelling of systematic theology, which is not based upon Holy Scripture, not on the mere letter, but the spirit which is contained in it. If

systematic theology be compelled to own that it has forsaken this source, it may on that very account be doubted whether what it teaches deserves the name of Christianity at all. And for this very reason the necessity has become more plainly apparent that the exegetical function of systematic theology should be duly prepared on exegetical ground. This exegetical treatment of the Old and New Testament Scriptures, especially the latter, and therein chiefly of our Lord's own precepts, if shaped so as to constitute it a preparation for the exegetical function of systematic theology, is not limited to isolated exegesis or to mere biblical commentary, but really extends to the development of entire biblical systems of thought as they lie before us in the New Testament ; first in the teaching of Jesus in His discourses, and then of the different apostles in the epistles or other apostolical writings. These systems of thought are to be so investigated that in the first place the individual ideas and precepts contained in all allied writings and statements may be separately examined, and their organic connection brought out by a comprehensive view. But even this is not enough. It is important also to ascertain the mutual relation of these several systems of thought as one of essential agreement, no less than of a certain difference ; for by so doing the characteristic peculiarities of their authors are successively brought to view. In this way truths and ideas themselves identical are found to be exhibited under various aspects, in different combinations with other truths, and under different modes of arrangement. It is exactly this which gives such a many-sided vitality to the Christianity of the New Testament, and by which such a large measure of fruitfulness is ensured. But systematic theology cannot, of course, undertake inquiries of this nature, which belong to exegesis, and furnish a theme for its highest point—the biblical theology of the Old and New Testament. New Testament theology, in dealing with the various New Testament Scriptures, enables them to be used as a single record of divine revelation. It sets forth the different systems of thought in their unity and manifold variety, and shows us how their total result presents a united record of the divine word ; not, however, a unity devoid of difference, but rather the harmony of difference,—that is to say, a unity which preserves its harmony through the organic interlacing of differences, and is itself rich in the detail of its component parts. Consequently, where this

function of New Testament theology is first in operation, the way is opened for that use of Holy Scripture which has become a necessity to systematic theology.

But in order that our science may prove competent to its task and maintain its high interest, it must adhere closely to the historical method involved in our very notion of it as distinguished from any dogmatic treatment. This latter was for a long time its usual mode of treatment. Men proceeded on the idea of Scripture being a divine book, the work of the Holy Spirit, a codex of divine revelation possessing a strict character of unity; whence it followed that biblical theology was necessarily treated dogmatically and not historically. Now, although Christian theology must undoubtedly admit a dogmatic conception of Holy Scripture, yet this forms only one side of it. The other side is that the Scriptures are composed by men under certain historical conditions: they must therefore be regarded as affected by the time of their appearance, and, consequently, not as possessing absolute unity, but a unity subject to a variety in historical development. It is a mistake to suppose that these two sides contradict each other: so far from it, one idea closely followed up will lead to the other. The dogmatic idea can, however, only be the gainer by our adopting here the purely historical mode of treatment, and treating the Scriptures like any other book whose purport is to be ascertained by a critical and exegetical process. The historical method, however, must not of course keep merely to the idea of what is actually recorded. History is the unfolding of life, in which a unity is broken up into details, and thus represents a certain regular course of events. It will thus be the province of New Testament theology to trace out the organic connection of New Testament teaching. And further, inasmuch as all history gains by the comparison of other facts analogous to its own subject-matter, this branch of inquiry must not here be lost sight of, and we shall have specially to deal with the parallels afforded by the Old Testament. Nor must reference to the religious idea be neglected, without, however, disturbing the historical point of view, and thereby allowing the distinctive method of our science to be transformed either into speculative inference or dogmatic treatment. Its system must descend to even minute division and classifications of the subject-matter itself, and of the combination of parts which is inherent in its historical character.

But a merely external juxtaposition of the parts is as much forbidden as would be their fusion into one indiscriminate mass. For the very reason that Christianity itself is our subject, there can be no question as to the impropriety of treating it from an outwardly historical point of view, in which persons or writings are merely taken as a basis of division, and dealt with accordingly. It is not individualities but the life in them with which we are concerned; not Holy Scripture *per se*, but the religion contained in it. Our subject must be treated and regarded as an historical phenomenon, as indeed it shows itself to be. Apologetic, polemic, and other tendencies may of themselves claim a place in the treatment of the subject; but their only right use is as accessories, not impairing the force of the historical procedure.

§ 2. *New Testament Christianity.*

The writings of the New Testament are what we regard as the historical sources from which our knowledge of primitive Christianity is derived. In our system, although Christianity is considered as a religion which is historically presented to us, it will not be followed throughout the whole course of its historical development, but only so far as it is presented in the writings of the New Testament. For the New Testament is to us the complex of the most ancient memorials of Christianity, wherein it appears in its earliest form. What these New Testament Scriptures consist of must here be taken for granted as the result of our introductory inquiry: only we must bear in mind, that it is almost impossible to arrive at any conclusion on this point which can be regarded as of universal validity. Perhaps only the first four of the Pauline epistles can be accepted as unquestioned in their authenticity. Therefore all that we are entitled to demand, is the acknowledgment of the New Testament Scriptures as the oldest memorials of the Christian religion. At any rate, they present it with a fulness and power of thought, which favours the supposition that they proceed from the most gifted amongst the ancient witnesses of Christianity. Ready as some are to place them as late as the second century, the question still remains, where are the men to whom we can ascribe the genius requisite to produce them? Are the writings of the apostolical fathers calculated in any way to invite us to adopt the above-named supposition? But even if we widen the limits for their origin so as to reach

the middle of the second century, yet they still remain the oldest monuments which have come down to us. On the other hand, if no more than those four Pauline epistles were unquestionably genuine, we should still have in them an ample test for deciding the question of what is or is not apostolic doctrine. Indeed, so sufficient would this little be, that we could gladly make it our groundwork in the investigation of primitive Christianity.

As a new religion, Christianity appears in contrast to all earlier ones, according to the words with regard to the "fulness of time" (Gal. iv. 4; Eph. i. 10). According to the latter of these passages, Christ gathers together in one all which was before confused in a scattered and manifold variety. That Christianity stands in a positive connection with the Old Testament, needs no special proof: the individual doctrinal systems show that it is, and in what sense it is, everywhere regarded as the fulfilment of the Old Testament. On the other hand, its relation to Gentile religions seems at first sight to be only that of contradiction, as when Christ (Matt. vi. 7, 8, 32) contrasts the Christian praying with that of the heathen as based upon an entirely different conception of God, or when He forbids religious community with the heathen (Matt. xviii. 17). His view of the Samaritan religion also includes a like judgment upon heathenism (Matt. xv. 24). No less does this opposition express itself in apostolical dicta, such as Eph. ii. 3, Gal. iv. 8 (cf. 1 Pet. iv. 3), and also in the apostolical discourses in the Acts of the Apostles, which speak of the darkness (xxvi. 18) of the times of ignorance (xvii. 30), or, less strongly, of the "own ways" (xiv. 16) of the heathen. But as on the other side, also, Christianity everywhere is contrasted with the state of childhood (Gal. iv. 3, 9; Col. ii. 8), the curse (Gal. iii. 13, cf. 2 Cor. iii. 9), and the letter which "killeth" (2 Cor. iii. 6 sq.) of legal religion, it must equally be borne in mind that the heathen no less than the Jews are regarded as receptive of salvation (Matt. xxviii. 19; Luke xxiv. 47; Col. i. 23; Gal. ii. 7-9; Rom. xi. 13; Eph. iii. 1). Jesus not only acknowledges the same (Matt. xv. 28, cf. 24; Luke vii. 9), but He also announces the future participation of the heathen as a great fact (Matt. viii. 10 sq.; John x. 16). The apostolical view also is early brought out in the fact, that the heathen were not obliged to be first admitted through Judaism (Acts xv. 6-11, x. 44-48). And this capability of salvation on their part was very soon

established as an historical fact. From this position of susceptibility thus much at least follows as the view taken in the New Testament, that the underlying religious element is not absolutely destroyed by the influence of heathenism, and consequently that something besides unmixed error may be found in it. Now comes the question, whether this element is consciously recognised in the New Testament. We find Jesus Himself in actual contact with those heathens only who received miraculous help from Him. And it is only on the supposition that the Greeks (John xii. 20 sq.) were really heathen who took part in the feast after the manner of proselytes of the gate, that contact of a more general nature can be said to have taken place. But since He refers them to the future, it follows that, as regards any conscious recognition on His part, it was merely with a view to the future that He put His religion within their reach. The Apostle Paul, however, pronounces more closely as to the above-named positive relation, discovering real points of union with the heathen, and on that account confessing himself able to conform to some of their usages (1 Cor. ix. 19–22). In the Epistle to the Romans he depicts the natural, religious, and moral disposition of the heathen, and in the Areopagus at Athens alludes to this disposition and to their guesses after truth,—quoting, indeed, the utterance of one of their own poets, by the confession contained in which the tendency of his apostolic discourse is suggested. He addresses himself to their conscience (Rom. ii.), and therefore refers them in the Areopagus to the future judgment. But with all this, Christianity remains throughout the New Testament the only true and perfect religion (John viii. 32, xvii. 14, 17; 1 John i. 2; Gal. iii. 1; 2 John 1; Eph. i. 13; Col. i. 5, 6; 2 Thess. ii. 10 sq.; 1 Pet. ii. 6), standing everywhere in contrast to “weak and beggarly elements” (*στοιχεῖα*, Gal. iv. 9; Col. ii. 8, 20), amongst which the Old Testament religion itself is included.

Christianity, although a system of doctrine, is never confined to mere doctrine. It is only in its low forms that religion presents itself in symbol and myth as a bare expression of feeling and imagination. Even the Old Testament is of a much more didactic character than the heathen religions; and still more so Christianity, a special attribute of which is producing and moulding into shape a connected and intelligible system. Still the gospel message itself is a sufficient proof that every later scho-

lastic and rationalistic view which could find in it nothing but doctrine, takes a one-sided view of the question. The word is from beginning to end the explanation of a fact,—of the fact that the kingdom of God is come near, and that the Saviour has appeared,—that He has perfected His work, and poured out His Spirit upon all who believe in Him. Nothing, therefore, could be further from the truth than the rationalistic distinction between the religion of Jesus and His religious teaching. Jesus Himself teaches, but His whole rich store of precept is nothing else than the announcement of Himself as the manifested Christ. Everything besides is merely preparation for, or explanation and application of, that one statement. In St. John's Gospel it is clear that all the teaching relates to the Person of Jesus; but in the other three also this Person is the centre and groundwork of the whole new religion: Him we must confess (Matt. x. 32), and suffer for His sake (Matt. v. 11). Here also we have, as the real essence of Christianity, a fact on which all the teaching is based, the history of an actual life. The whole body of apostolic doctrine has reference to the same fact, especially to the turning-point of the life of Jesus. To this, however, is added a further historical basis, the communication of the Holy Spirit, and the life of the community of believers in Jesus which is founded thereon. These two leading facts, then, are the groundwork and hypothesis on which all development of apostolic doctrine must rest. If we take them away, the New Testament teaching is without either foundation or vital power, a plant decaying of itself. The simple view of the New Testament Scriptures leads us to the same result. They are partly historical, partly doctrinal writings. The historical writings have been admitted into the canon because Christians regard as the very source of their belief the historical appearance of the Messiah of Nazareth, and the advent and development of the life proceeding from Him, and depending on the communication of His Spirit. As a first consequence of this fact, Christianity presents itself on one side as a system of doctrine, and on the other as an established community. The teaching is an essential element, because some announcement of the fact is necessary. The teaching of Jesus is the statement of His self-consciousness, and in like manner the apostolic doctrine expresses the consciousness of the life gradually developing itself in the community.

The historical life which constitutes Christianity appears in the

New Testament as life from God. The life of Jesus depends upon His being in the Father, and the Father in Him; the fullness of the Godhead dwelling in Him bodily, and streaming forth from Him. The life of believers owes its existence to God, and depends upon a birth from the Spirit, the awakening of men through the word of truth. Hence the word which contains the announcement of this historical life is itself endowed with a divine life-giving power (cf. Rom. i. 16), and is the power of God and the wisdom of God (1 Cor. i. 24). As life from God, it is the living manifestation of God, and indeed the one perfecting manifestation which redeems mankind (John vi. 45-47; Matt. xi. 25-27). The doctrine and fellowship which are developed from it, are therefore divine teaching and a divinely established fellowship, the foregoing fact remaining equally the source of both. Such is the general aspect of Christianity in the New Testament. It thus finds its parallel in the Old Testament, where also fact rather than doctrine takes the foremost place. This fact is the old preparatory covenant between God and man,—at first, indeed, limited to one family, and afterwards to one nation. Old Testament theology has, therefore, to represent this revelation of the covenant first in patriarchal times, and then in the national development, as Mosaism, Prophetism, and lastly Judaism. Both Testaments rest on a common foundation of the divine revelation, the first with particular limits in kind and degree, the second with the character of universal religion.

The fundamental fact which when received into human consciousness is also the fundamental doctrine of Christianity, is the life which proceeds from God, or, God manifested for the salvation of mankind. The treatment of this falls naturally under two heads: (1st) the appearance of this life, immediately followed by (2d) the commencement of its great work for man's salvation;—or, firstly, its manifestation in Jesus Christ; and, secondly, the foundation of the primitive apostolic church. Thus we have two periods, the Messianic and the apostolic, which are distinct both as to time and character. The first comprehends the days of the Son of man (Luke xvii. 22; John viii. 56; Heb. v. 7; Matt. ix. 15; Mark ii. 19; Luke v. 34), and its subject is Jesus Christ come in the flesh (1 John iv. 2), and the manifestation of God in Him (John xvii. 6; Matt. xi. 27). The apostolic period, which is established through the Spirit (Acts i

8 ; John xiv. 26 ; Matt. x. 20), embraces the time of the apostles' testimony (Acts i. 21), and carries on the representation of the revelation as having for its object to make known and glorify the Father and the Son in and through the Spirit (John xv. and xvi.). But inasmuch as Jesus spoke of the communication of this Spirit only under the form of a promise, John remarks (vii. 39) that the Holy Ghost was not yet given (cf. Luke xxiv. 49 ; Acts i. 8). Thus the New Testament itself distinctly recognises two periods of the revelation it unfolds. At first the divine life is contained exclusively in the person of Jesus and streams forth from Him alone ; subsequently it appears as an independent life in all believers. Some persons, indeed, have despaired of being able to carry out the above-named distinction, and therefore represent everything as apostolic doctrine, because a line cannot be clearly drawn between the latter and the historical purport of Christ's teaching and appearance.¹ But the apostolic church itself was conscious of possessing a true conception of Jesus. This she has presented in the gospels ; and New Testament theology must accept it from her, although still permitted to investigate its historical truth. But neither has its general credibility been seriously shaken hitherto, nor will it ever be possible to give a really historical representation of the *origines* of Christianity without adhering to this distinction.

The very nature of Christianity requires that it should in every age first appear as *life* in an historical form ; then, and not till then, as doctrine. Every period will thus be divided into an historical and a didactic portion. The former of these, however, will not be an enumeration of every isolated fact ; for this would not suffice us. What we require is New Testament Christianity as such, that is to say, the characteristics of the divinely human life of Jesus, and of the inspired lives of those who believe in Him. It is not a question of outward events, which are only taken into account so far as they are manifestations of this peculiar life. Hence arises the selection of the facts and the mode of their representation. In treating of the Messianic period, we do not therefore propose to give a biography of Jesus, but to trace in the details of His history the unity of the divine life in Him. We shall, therefore, notice in the first place those facts only in which this divine life is manifested ; but where many facts reveal

¹ So Matthäi, and more recently Hahn.

only one side of it, they may be grouped together under one head, so that, instead of treating the miracles and discourses of Jesus separately, our subject would be His effectual working in both combined. Similarly, in the apostolic period, we are concerned not so much with the persons of the apostles as with the new life in the apostolic church, and consequently with the statement of those facts which are calculated to throw light upon the nature of the new life of the Spirit. We must also at this point endeavour to draw out the spirit from the history before us. A mode of treatment might be devised by which the historical and doctrinal elements might be exhibited in a form of internal unity; but since this unity is not directly represented in the New Testament itself, there would be danger of treating the subject rather from a dogmatical than from an historical point of view. It will therefore be better to take the historical element by itself, which can be done the more briefly, inasmuch as it is concerned only with traits of character.

FIRST PART.

THE MESSIANIC AGE.

§ 3. *Introduction.—Our Sources of Knowledge.*



THE direct sources of information for the Messianic period of New Testament Christianity, are the four canonical gospels and some few passages of the other New Testament Scriptures.

Inasmuch as light is thrown upon the contents of these principal sources in more than one way through comparison, partly with the apostolic period of New Testament Christianity, partly with the oldest non-biblical accounts of the Messianic period, we are also indirectly concerned with the consideration of certain collateral and subsidiary sources. These are of three kinds: (1.) Those writings of the New Testament which relate to the apostolic period; (2.) Records of the times of Jesus not comprised in the canon, especially the Jewish history of that period; and (3.) Traditional accounts of His life. Among these sources, that matter is of the greatest importance which we have at our command in respect to the Jewish history of the period, whether in classical writers or in the known Jewish authors of the time; whilst other writings of obscurer origin, whether Jewish or mixed, as the Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament, are of more doubtful credibility. Less importance attaches to the special extra-biblical sources for the life of Jesus. This is due partly to their scantiness,—a defect which attaches not only to the few traces of a knowledge of the person of Jesus to be found in the classics, but even to the traditional fragments which have been handed down amongst Christians; partly also to the manifest distortion of historical truth which appears, for instance, in the apocryphal gospels, and in the traditions based upon them.

The canon contains four gospels, in accordance with the system which everywhere runs through it of giving a plurality of writ-

ings, which set forth the genius of primitive Christianity, and respectively throw light upon and supplement one another. They are not biographies, for they give the life of Jesus only with a view of proving His Messianic character. Consequently they aim at producing a true, but not a complete, picture, by a systematic grouping of characteristic features ; and thus they combine something of a dogmatic with their historical character. This shows itself most in John and Matthew (but compare the beginning of Luke with the end of John). They may, therefore, one and all be said to represent the public life of Jesus from His baptism onwards, not offering reflections upon the facts related, but only putting them together in such a way as to exhibit the true character of the Messianic life. The Hellenistic language is at the same time common to them all. The Synoptists, however, are distinguished from John by describing our Lord's ministry in Galilee only, extending their account subsequently to Peræa and the final scene at Jerusalem. John, on the other hand, represents the appearances of Jesus in Judea and Galilee alternately. In John the discourses are more central, in the Synoptists less so. From the sixth chapter onwards John gives for the most part the direct testimony of Jesus Himself as to His person and His work ; the others abound more in such discourses as stand in preparative reference to this. The Sermon on the Mount is of this kind : it introduces us to the moral spirit of the kingdom of God, and so far cannot be said to be entirely uncentral in its character, yet its precepts do not aim at directly representing that spiritual kingdom, the righteousness of which it describes, as the kingdom to be founded, ruled, and perfected by Him, Jesus Christ. Intimations to this effect are not wanting, but they appear more in the background. Of discourses of this kind the synoptic gospels contain also, for instance, certain collections of parables (Matt. xiii. ; Luke viii., xiv. ff.). But inasmuch as the synoptic gospels also are not wanting in elements of doctrine, which are entirely of the nature of central truths, because they treat directly of the Messiah's person, or of the relation of Jesus of Nazareth to His work, they too favour the conviction that with due regard to time and circumstance our Lord always incorporated both kinds of doctrinal elements in His discourses. And although those recorded by John appear to bear more immediate reference to Jesus as the Christ, the Son of God, the *σωτὴρ τοῦ κόσμου*, this exactly

falls in with the whole scheme of this gospel, which from beginning to end aims at representing the divine manifestation of the *Logos* made flesh in the person of Jesus of Nazareth. But this does not occasion any deficiency of matter, which, although quite characteristic of John, yet shows the most decided points of contact with elements of doctrine found in the synoptic evangelists; and this statement will be fully borne out in the following pages. In John, again, there is more precision of historical structure; for not only does he give the progress of events in exact chronological order, but he shows also their development from the very first towards the final catastrophe, in the gradually increasing hostility to Jesus, of which, as well as of its consequences, He Himself is represented as fully conscious. In short, John's standpoint is more universal in its character; that of the synoptics more national. This distinction, however, is not absolute: even the author of the fourth gospel plainly shows himself to belong to the Jewish nationality. Amongst the Synoptists Matthew shows the most regard to events, and often attends more to facts than to their chronological order. Luke shows that he has combined fragments collected from external sources, but at the same time deals with our Saviour's youth as a systematic and beautiful whole. If Matthew writes for the Jewish Christians, Luke on the other hand writes from the Pauline standpoint for the use of Gentile converts. Mark is distinguished by little else than his brevity.

Although we no longer possess the original of Matthew's Gospel, which, according to the unanimous tradition of Christian antiquity, was written in the Aramaic language, yet the Greek text has been always unhesitatingly acknowledged to be identical with the gospel written by Matthew, and there is no sufficient ground for not regarding it as a genuine translation of that Aramaic original. It may be easily supposed that this original was at an early period altered by the Jewish Christian sects, and thus lost in its integrity, on which account the translation in which alone it was accessible acquired all the more value. The quotations from the Old Testament in many cases do not correspond either with the LXX. or with the Hebrew text, and in this very probably follow the Aramaic gospel, which no doubt even in quotations paid regard to the interpretations of a passage which prevailed in the current paraphrases of the day. The statement

that we have nothing more of Matthew's own than a collection of discourses, does not seem probable from the testimony adduced on the subject. The objections, however, which have been made to the historical part of the gospel admit of a different explanation. The didactic element is certainly the strongest, and a preference is shown by its author for the combination of more numerous or longer discourses. When, therefore, he condenses the historical element into a few leading features, this is sufficiently explained by the predominant direction of his mind, and by the design of bringing prominently forward the conception of the Messiahship of Jesus, which was the guiding principle in his selection of topics. The other Synoptists are, like him, silent as to the earlier period of Christ's ministry in Jerusalem, although allusions to it are to be found both in Matthew (xxiii. 37) and in Luke (xiii. 34); cf. also Luke x. 38 ff. This has been already accounted for in a general way by the structural feature visible in them all, whereby we are led on, from the preparation and consecration of Jesus, through the characteristic events of His public ministry to the closing scene. Now, as it is certain that Matthew afforded a type for the other gospels, his late call also affords a point of explanation (Matt. ix. 9); and, further, the circumstance that without doubt Jesus was not accompanied by the whole number of His disciples on all His journeys even to Jerusalem (cf. John vii., and the sending forth of the disciples, Matt. x.; also Luke x.). Now, if Matthew was either partially or wholly absent at the festival visits, this sufficiently accounts for his only mentioning what occurred in Galilee and Peræa. No doubt he had, as an apostle, delivered the purport of his gospel by word of mouth many times before he committed it to writing. In this way, then, the narration of his own experience naturally fell into its present shape, and this was passed on as a type from him to the others.

The Gospel of Mark, although it displays less originality than the others, yet contains enough that is peculiar to itself, partly in particular narratives, partly in the independent treatment of individual circumstances, to show that it cannot have been entirely formed from the Gospels of Luke and Matthew, although it may have been partially derived from them. But other sources besides must have been at his command. And individual traits, such as the statement of events at Gethsemane, in which he alone

has the address to Simon, are best explained by adhering to the tradition of his connection with Peter. The deficiency of earlier history in his gospel may be accounted for in the same way. This is strange even if his work were original, but incomprehensible if the other gospels lay before him, unless we suppose that he was guided by the recollection of the method adopted by Peter in his didactic discourses, as we know them from the Acts of the Apostles.

In Luke, the parabolic element specially prevails, and he has, besides, many narrations in which the didactic and historical elements are combined. His history of the resurrection is particularly copious, as well as the account, peculiar to himself, in the ninth chapter, of a circuitous journey to Jerusalem. This gospel has a strong historical testimony in its favour, in its early misuse by Marcion, and also in its connection with the Acts of the Apostles, which are evidently written in part by an eye-witness. And if Luke was really for any considerable period the companion of the Apostle Paul, this would account for his being able to make personal investigation in Palestine of the events related in the gospel.

As regards our fourth gospel, the testimony of Christian antiquity, bearing partly on the gospel itself, and partly on the first of the epistles connected with it, and also its internal distinctive features, authenticate it as the genuine work of the Apostle John sufficiently to overcome the doubts even of modern criticism. As internal evidence in its favour, may be mentioned not only individual traits, which betray an eye-witness's exact knowledge of facts, but, above all, the historical unity of the whole, in which a development so much in accordance with facts is revealed. Its universality of scope, and freedom from national limitations, have in particular been thought suspicious; but this arises only from the fact of their having been exaggerated and represented from a one-sided point of view. Moreover, it depicts the Jewish surroundings of Jesus both as a whole and in detail with sharply defined Jewish characteristics. John relates only a smaller number of characteristically selected miracles, but these well represent the whole miraculous agency of Jesus. The evangelist shows himself to have a thorough insight into the latter as a whole, and gives to it the importance due to it amongst the causes of Jesus' success. Thus, for example, in Jerusalem (ii. 23, viii. 30 ff.);

and also in Galilee ; for the activity in that place is plainly enough put forward (iv. 45, vi. 1-15, cf. 66). That the conception found of Jesus Himself is not a really different one in the Synoptists and in John, has to be shown by the setting forth of the teaching so as to form one single conception of Him derived from both sources. Again, the general course of our Lord's career is not differently represented in the two accounts ;—at least, any one must have greatly prejudged the question who could venture to maintain that, according to the Synoptists, there were no drawbacks to the success of our Lord's ministry, even up to the time of the final catastrophe ; and likewise that John's conception of the character of Jesus is stiff, lifeless, and unvarying. In conclusion, we must remark that the evangelist knew how to distinguish the discourses and doctrine of Jesus from his own ideas. We are in a position to show that it is quite possible to exhibit separately the Apostle John's system of doctrine, and that of Jesus as set forth in this gospel ; albeit a certain colouring in the rendering of the discourses may belong to the narrator. The gospels generally give the grandest picture of a divinely-human personality, whose superhuman claims are yet comprised in all their ethical greatness, and pervade the whole mass of the narrative. To have produced such a picture far exceeds the power of a mere narrator. But, in John's Gospel especially, the discourses of Jesus are drawn so much out of the inmost depths of this life itself, that there can be no difficulty in deciding whether to acknowledge their authenticity or to ascribe them to an author of the second century. Not even to an apostle could we venture to attribute them.

To speak, in the next place, of the different ways in which these writings have been understood. The allegorical interpretation sprang up on a field foreign to Christianity ; it was soon continued in the Church only in the form of edifying application, and subsisted in this way for a long time side by side with the historical mode of interpretation, and on the same basis. It was reserved for the last century to resuscitate the revolting hypothesis of a deceptive design brought forward by the exasperated and desperate enemies of Christianity ; but this soon succumbed to the verdict of public opinion. On the other side, the so-called natural explanation was involved in difficulties which soon made it impossible. Thus nothing remained for those who would not

acknowledge the historical truth of the gospels, but the assumption that they were traditions which had their origin in the inventive and poetizing spirit of the people. And this view was adopted more eagerly in proportion to the interest taken in the traditions of antiquity. But it is, moreover, on external grounds impossible that tradition should have been able to substitute a mass of fictions for genuine historical records in the Church. For, as the most unsuspected apostolical testimony in the epistolary portions of the New Testament show, the life of Jesus was never left to be attested by tradition of this kind ; but, being at first in the hands of the apostles themselves, was handed down from them by means of a well-ordered ecclesiastical ministry. The more impossible it became on historical grounds to regard the whole existence and life of Jesus as a myth, the more inducements there were for endeavouring to assume signs of a mythical element in the narratives themselves. These signs, however, are not restricted to the universal criteria of historical truth ; but those which possess most force and widest application are always deduced from a view of nature and history, which excludes miracles, or from a lower view of the person of Jesus, which is opposed to everything that tends to glorify Him, and consequently bases the history on nothing better than dogmatic hypothesis. But what tells most decisively against the mythical view, is the fact which cannot be got over, that the origin of these myths does not admit of a sufficient explanation, either on a retrospective or prospective view of the history. For, as regards the first, the Christian Messiah was, notwithstanding the basis laid for Him in the ground of the Old Testament, an entirely different person from him whom the Jews expected ; and, as for the second, the original Christian conception, from which Jesus is said to have sprung, is based simply on history. The characteristic of this conception plainly is, that it has its origin in a redeeming life. And the fact of the redemption of mankind, which lay from the beginning in the Christian consciousness, does not consist in the existence of the idea, but in the reality of the life sought for. Without this, Christianity would sink to the level of ante-Christian religions ; it would be, like them, an endless seeking after truth, instead of wearing as its distinctive characteristic that it has found it in Christ.

Apart from the external evidence in their favour, which lies in the style and recognition of the gospel writings themselves

and is referred to in biblical introduction, the decisive ground for their acceptance as real history lies in the existence of the apostolic church, and in its inner growth and incorporation with the life of Jesus. This apostolic church, however, offers us direct as well as indirect proofs. In the apostolic letters, as didactic and hortatory epistles addressed to already existing communities, we cannot, of course, expect to find any description of the life of Jesus; but the principal facts of His life are constantly referred to as historically known and certain. Cf. on the subject of His life and parentage, 2 Cor. viii. 9; Phil. ii. 7; Rom. i. 3, cf. ix. 5; 2 Tim. ii. 8; Gal. iv. 4;—on His sufferings, death, and resurrection, 1 Cor. ii. 8; 1 Cor. xv. 3, 4; Rom. vi. 9, 10;—on His dignity and sinlessness and His work, Rom. viii. 3, 4; 2 Cor. xiii. 4; Rom. viii. 17, 34, xiv. 9, 10, cf. ii. 6, 16; 2 Cor. v. 21; Rom. iv. 25, v. 11 ff.; 1 Cor. xv. 45; 1 Cor. viii. 6; 2 Cor. iv. 4; Rom. viii. 9 ff. Upon this rests the whole Pauline Christology. Now Paul was certainly not an eye-witness, and his evangelical announcement was quite an original one (Gal. i.); but yet he was in communication with eye-witnesses of the facts (Gal. ii.), and must have collected from them information about what had happened. We see, for instance, how, with regard to the Last Supper, he appeals to some definite information on the subject (1 Cor. xi.); and, in speaking of the resurrection, to the minutely detailed external testimony on which it rests (1 Cor. xv.). He is also careful, where precepts of life are concerned (1 Cor. vii.), to distinguish between matters actually determined by Jesus, and his own or any other opinions respecting them. Thus we find both requisites,—that he rests upon history, and that he deals with it in the most conscientious manner. Equally strong testimony to the same principal facts is borne by the Apostle John, who, in his first epistle, speaks of himself in the most positive terms as an eye-witness; and the evidence of Peter (1 Epist.) and of James is of the same kind. So also, outside the canon of Scripture, the unvarying tradition of the ancient church speaks of a firmly rooted and abiding conviction on this subject. The very silence of Josephus is a testimony for the life of Jesus; for, had he been able to disprove the validity of the Christian statement, he would certainly have done so. The conclusion is irresistible, that the existence of the Christian church and of the idea on which it rests is a fact which can be explained

in no other way than by the extraordinary personality and history which are claimed for it. It is contrary to all historical analogy that a number of obscure individuals should have been the authors of these world-transforming ideas, except under the genuine guidance of a master spirit. And without doubt it would have far exceeded the capability of such narrators, and still more of the disciples in general, to work out by their own unaided powers the conception of such a personality; and herein exactly lies its historical probability, or, indeed, truth.

All objections to the miraculous element in the appearance of Jesus are easily removed, if we look at the grand inner harmony of the picture of His life which is presented to us. It is a perfect human personality which meets us there. Where it transcends the limits of mere humanity, it still exhibits amidst all its personal power a discretion so meek and lowly, that we are compelled either to regard Him as a fanatic or an impostor; or, failing to reconcile either of these suppositions with His human character, to acknowledge that He was neither one nor the other, but that His supernatural claim rests in the inmost depths of His consciousness, and was therefore a true one. Understood in this way, this absolutely unique personality agrees with the historically unique character of Christianity. But, notwithstanding its miraculous nature, it also forms a part of an organized system, which has its roots in the whole period of revelation antecedent to the appearance of Jesus, and, in its subsequent effects, buds, blossoms, and bears fruit. Indeed, it has been thought to be a characteristic of the myth, that the fact shows itself as the highest development of an historically antecedent idea. But why should not God carry out the purposes for which He has so prepared the way? The effects are, however, quite homogeneous to the miraculous beginning. The more firmly, therefore, the main fact is established, the greater right we have to demand that the first question asked by an impartial inquirer should be, What has taken place? and then, How is it to be accounted for? Also, that characteristics should not be presupposed of everything which has taken place which run counter to the very character of the facts, and make them antecedently impossible, because a certain philosophical view looks upon every miracle as impossible. But the rejection of all that is miraculous cannot constitute itself the law of historical inquiry.

The true critic will hold fast to the main historical facts and all that is necessarily involved in them; and, in the next place, he will apply to the accounts in question the test of their internal agreement. These accounts exhibit some points of difference. But this is the case with the most notorious facts of profane history, without any one dreaming of its being necessary on that account to call in question the facts themselves. Many difficulties, arising from this varied mode of presentation, vanish of themselves as soon as the task of forming a judgment is simply set about with an honest purpose. So far as some of these statements bear a peculiar stamp, the fact is explained by the copiousness of form and expression assumed by the grandeur of our Lord's personality. On the other hand, we see in the above-cited example of the Apostle Paul (1 Cor. vii.), how conscientiously, in apostolic times, the authentic discourses of Jesus were selected and handed down. With this agrees the careful transmission of the discourses in Matthew; and even in John it can be shown how well he distinguishes the discourses of Jesus and their type of doctrine from his own. The subjective nature of the representation takes nothing from its historical character. It is itself only an indirect proof of the powerful influence which was at work. But, where the same circumstances are differently reported, the critic has to decide whether the facts are really identical or not, only he must do this on historical, not on philosophical grounds. No theory of inspiration can prevent our acknowledging the existence of such elements of uncertainty. The method of biblical theology is of necessity purely historical, and hence the manner alone in which the Scripture expresses itself can here be considered. And here the general possibility must be admitted, that even a decided theory of divine inspiration may be compatible with the admission of individual elements not strictly authentic, provided only that the transmission of that which regards the nature of Christianity lies under no suspicion.

FIRST DIVISION.

THE LIFE OF JESUS

§ 4. *Nature of the Subject.*

CHRISTIANITY in the Messianic period is essentially bound up with the person of Jesus of Nazareth; and herein a distinction must be drawn between His historical appearance and the didactic expression of the Messianic consciousness in the teaching of Jesus. Now, all that is aimed at here being to describe the essential features of Christianity during this period, our sketch will certainly embrace the whole life of Jesus, but not in its details. Hence it is clearly not a biography of Jesus,—a subject, however, which has possessed a copious literature of its own since the last quarter of the 18th century. The essential facts are what we are most concerned with, and these are the turning-points in our Lord's history, as His birth related by two, His death, resurrection, and glorification by all four, evangelists; and also a compendium of historical details, so far as they display the nature of the Messianic person. It is not necessary, for instance, to describe every individual miracle, but only in general our Lord's activity in works of that kind, and its characteristic features as an essential phase of His historical manifestation.

The early history of Jesus must also form a part of our present plan; and it will be necessary to investigate the question, in which sense the birth and youth of Jesus form essential parts of His personal manifestation.

I. THE EARLY HISTORY OF JESUS.

§ 5. *A General View of the Above*

The accounts of Jesus' early years, compared with those of His public life, stand in a different relation to the gospel preaching of

the apostles and their coadjutors. For only the later events could form the topic of a discourse intended to make proselytes. It was the public life only which could found a new faith; other things could do no more than contribute to its support. And it was of importance before unbelievers that the facts should be attested by contemporary evidence. On this account Mark and John begin with the public life, and even in the Acts, John's baptism is adhered to as the starting-point of the apostolic testimony (Acts i. 21, 22, x. 36-41, 37, 39, xiii. 24); and for the same reason also the feast of the Epiphany is prior in historical importance to that of Christmas. But, as the interest a believer takes in the subject is different from that of an unbeliever, it becomes necessary to trace the life of Jesus to its source; and this requirement had to be satisfied in the gospels written for the church. A more general Christian interest than that exhibited in St. Matthew must be presupposed in the man to whom Luke's Gospel is addressed. The evangelist himself evidently possessed the extensive scheme and comprehensive grasp of the true historian; and his aim had in view the whole province of the attainable. Although this might have been possible by fictitious narrative, either intentional and conscious, or unintentional and mythical, yet authentic traditions and historical investigation would be equally available for the same purpose; and these were accessible to the apostles and their contemporaries, who had our Lord's mother living amongst them (Acts i. 14, cf. John xix. 26, 27). The objection that even the family of Jesus had no belief in Him (John vii.; Mark iii.) cannot be maintained. In the expression of doubt concerning Him recorded by Mark (iii. 21) Mary herself took no part; and it is quite in the nature of things that she should prefer to ponder in her own thoughtful spirit over the earlier events, rather than make them known prematurely even to her nearest relatives. In the case of our Lord's brethren, the proverb about the prophet in his own country was certainly fulfilled to the letter; yet they also believed after the resurrection.

Whether the accounts relating to this period are to be regarded as trustworthy, obviously depends upon the genuineness of the opening chapters of Matthew and Luke.

(a) The genuineness of the first two chapters of Matthew has been often attacked and defended since the last quarter of the last century. The external reasons against them founded on the nature

of the manuscripts will not bear investigation. The use of the chapters in question amongst the fathers extends as far back as Justin, who, in his dialogue with Trypho, quotes as from Matthew the Old Testament passages therein referred to, and manifestly makes free use of him himself. Celsus, on the other hand, as we learn from Origen, disputed the genuineness of these accounts. They make good their claim, however, to be regarded as original portions of Matthew's Gospel, not only by their language, which might be laid to the account of the Greek translators, but also by their whole general mode of expression. The Ebionites and the Gnostics alike rejected them on dogmatic grounds. For these dogmas made them necessarily averse not only to the history of our Lord's birth, but also to the genealogy (in which, ver. 16, Mary is mentioned), and to the story of the magi; for, according to the Ebionites, who held that Jesus first became the Messiah at His baptism, His star could not have shown itself so early.

(b) Against the genuineness of the first two chapters of Luke only Marcion can be adduced, but his criticism proves nothing at all. The only inference which can be drawn from the Jewish vein of thought which runs through them, is that Luke met with some earlier sources of information, which he regarded as completely trustworthy.

It only remains, therefore, to apply the principles of internal criticism to the narrative itself, and that chiefly on the formal ground of the relation which the two accounts bear to each other, and their discrepancies or incompatibility. Both accounts are undeniably of a fragmentary character. The only circumstances they possess in common are the proof of our Lord's descent from David (but dealt with in different ways), the account of His supernatural generation, and of His birth at Bethlehem. Matthew's narrative, however, is given from Joseph's standpoint, Luke's from that of Mary; and the two are therefore quite independent of each other. Matthew's object is to demonstrate the Messianic character of Jesus from His earliest youth by means of the history of the magi, and of His rescue from the consequent peril of His life, no less than by the genealogy and proof of His supernatural birth. He is satisfied when he has attained this object, which he clearly indicates by referring back to the Messianic prophecies themselves. Luke has essentially the same object in view, retracing as he does the connection between Jesus and John the

Baptist to its source, adding some scenes from the childhood of the former, which had impressed themselves deeply on the mother's heart. Now, the fragmentary character of such a history of his youth almost necessitates that one statement should deviate from the other even to the extent of appearing to contradict it. But there is no real discrepancy. For we can easily suppose that the presentation in the Temple may have taken place before the arrival of the magi. The statement at first sight opposed to this (Luke ii. 39) is merely the form in which the evangelist passes on to his main subject, the events which took place at Nazareth.

The return to Nazareth, by a journey of several days, immediately after the presentation, is not in itself very probable; but the presentation must by no means be regarded on that account as having taken place after the flight into Egypt. The fragmentary character, therefore, of these notices explains the difficulty of the return to Nazareth appearing, according to Luke's account, to follow upon the presentation, whereas it took place, as Matthew relates, from out of Egypt; and also the appearance, according to St. Matthew, of Bethlehem having been their earlier abode. But we must also notice that Joseph, from whose standpoint Matthew proceeds, certainly belonged to Bethlehem, even though he may have had no house there. (As to the double pedigree, see below.) Thus much, at least, is proved by the existence of *two* accounts, that there was not originally any *one* of sole and undisputed authority,—a fact perfectly consistent with the credibility of the various existing narrations, of which each of the two evangelists has handed down a portion in internal agreement with the other, Matthew giving greater prominence to its retrospective bearing on the Old Testament, Luke to matters of more purely historical interest.

Thus the chief objection to the accounts, entertained even by biographers of Jesus who otherwise admit the historical character of the individual,—which, too, has afforded such facilities for attacks like that of Strauss,—lies entirely in the tenor of the accounts themselves. People demur to the supernatural occurrences which are related, not considering that the same objection, if valid, attaches to the whole life no less than to the early childhood of Jesus: the one is not more full of wonders than the other. If the truth of the former be admitted,—of the noble and harmonious picture of the life of Jesus as it is presented in the gospels, with every re-

quisite not only for leading captive but also for completely satisfying the human soul, the only picture which is at all adequate to the true idea of Christianity and its world-wide importance and activity,—then must we allow that the early history in Matthew and Luke fully corresponds to the harmonious whole. It is entirely owing to this miraculous manifestation that the higher life has attained even its present degree of development in human nature. And it is a sufficient answer to the speculation which finds this miracle impossible, to point to the course of history developed during the last two thousand years as the superstructure resting on that foundation.

It must, indeed, be allowed that these accounts occupy a different position to that of the apostolic testimony to our Lord's later life. For, as regards these earlier events, the apostles were not eye but ear witnesses. We have, therefore, only two accounts of this history, and there is but little which is related in both. This circumstance, however, does not affect their credibility.

§ 6. *Descent and Birth of Jesus.*

The principal fact of the conception is unequivocally and unanimously indicated by both evangelists. Matthew implies it (i. 16) by the omission of the form *ἐγέννησε* in the genealogy, and verse 18 leaves no doubt on the point. The preposition *ἐκ* excludes every other explanation, as, for instance, in conformity with the Holy Ghost, *i.e.* with foregoing prophecy, or in a manner well pleasing to the Holy Ghost, approved of God, and not criminal in the eyes of man. In addition to this, however, all such interpretations are excluded by the historical connection in regard to the behaviour of Joseph. A natural conception by another man,—a crime, according to national ideas, worthy of death,—does not agree with either of the above-mentioned explanations. The sense is therefore clear. It is a conception brought about without man's participation by the creative power of God. And precisely the same fact is undeniably asserted by St. Luke also. The negative side of it is expressed by Mary (i. 34), and the positive by the angel (i. 35). The *ἄγιον* (neuter, because it is the yet impersonal foetus) will be the Son of God, in the same immediate creative sense as Adam (iii. 38); so that here also we are referred to the creative power of God, to the exclusion of any masculine human agency.

The foremost objection urged against these accounts is, that they are internally contradictory. Although the details follow one another easily and conformably to fact,—viz. the announcement to Mary, Mary's visit to Elisabeth, the announcement to Joseph, and our Saviour's birth,—still a contradiction is supposed to lie in the fact, that the second angelic message followed as a simple repetition, without reference to the first, and with no blame for disbelief in the earlier one, and that between Mary and Joseph themselves no explanation had taken place. Now, there could have been no such reference or blame if Joseph were unaware of the earlier angelic message. But if he knew of it, the mere agreement between the two messages would doubtless have at once removed all uncertainty from his mind. And yet the very naturalness of the doubt, in the face of the unprecedented nature of the fact, would have removed all cause for blame. Besides which, it is uncertain whether Mary had thus early communicated it to him. But, in our ignorance whether she had in the interval any opportunities of confidential intercourse with him on the subject, or was not rather obliged to leave it in higher hands, we must pronounce her too free from blame. Thus no blame attaches in any case to either, and the accounts are natural and consistent.

But the event itself has of late been impugned on physico-theological grounds,—the attack being directed (1) physiologically against the circumstance of the miracle; (2) theologically against the purpose of it. As regards the latter, others have adopted Schleiermacher's view, that the exclusion of the merely paternal participation would not have sufficed to secure perfect sinlessness in the new life, which end, however, might have been attained by the mere purification of both sources of parentage alike. But this view quite overlooks the main point involved, namely, the exclusion of the sensual act of generation, which exclusion would entirely alter the maternal participation (cf. John i. 13). Thus, then, the fact appears quite adequate to the object in view; and, this object being parallel to that of creation itself, it is difficult to understand why a creative act, setting aside the laws of nature, could not possibly have been performed, those laws being themselves established only by the act and purpose of creation.

A further objection against the supernatural conception is of an historico-exegetical character, and is founded partly on the silence of the rest of the New Testament on this point, partly on doctrines

and facts held to be opposed to it. (a) The evangelists Matthew and Luke, it is said, make no further allusion to it. But this was unnecessary, since they had already given such decided prominence to the fact. And when the expressions *parents* and *father* occur (Luke ii. 41, 48), we must surely assume that they are used in the sense required by the immediately preceding narrative. In the same way, the fact of the Davidical genealogies running through Joseph is a proof that the evangelists at least did not regard these genealogies as contradicting the conception. Again, to suppose that Jesus Himself, in the face of depreciatory expressions as to His descent, should have referred to the mode of His origin, is nothing less than absurd; for this would only have exposed Him to fresh obloquy. He did all that could possibly be required in bearing witness to Himself simply as the Son of His heavenly Father, in the only true sense of that expression. (b) Allowing that the epistolary portion of the New Testament does not mention the fact (not even Rom. i. 3; Gal. iv. 4; Heb. vii. 3), the omission is of no importance. For it was not necessary to put this truth prominently forward in founding Christianity, but it was much more to the purpose of the apostles' teaching first to plant a faith in the higher nature of Jesus, from which faith the admission of the fact in question would necessarily follow. (c) But it has also been said that John's view of the incarnation, and of the indwelling of a divine hypostasis in Jesus, contradicts the conception by the Holy Ghost. So far from contradicting, his doctrine even requires it; for how could the result have been brought about without such a conception? This argument becomes irresistible when supported by the statement in John's Gospel, that what is born of the flesh is flesh. (d) Nor is it of any importance that Mark also, in his abridgment, passes over this fact unmentioned.

To the untenableness of the above-named objections, must be added the difficulty of assigning a mythical origin to the narrative. The facts brought forward to connect it with Old Testament ideas are of an entirely different nature. Something beyond a difference in degree must surely exist between distinguished men born of aged parents, and also the term *son of God* as applied to kings and heroes on the one hand, and to Him who owed His origin to no human father on the other. It is not only probable, from the scantiness of our information, but, from Justin's Dialogue with

Trypho, it is certain, that Isa. vii. was not interpreted messianically by the Jews. We must also bear in mind that the truth in question was most violently attacked by the Ebionites; and that the LXX. has been blamed for its translation *παρθένος* in this passage. But if the Jewish line of reference is closed against us, still less can the origin we are contending for be explained by an appeal to heathen analogies of sons of gods and various incarnations, all resting on entirely different hypotheses, apart from the extrinsic improbability of the idea as regards a narrative which belongs to the Hebraistic elements of St. Luke. This much alone is evident from these analogies, that the premonitory tendency of subjective religion is towards a reunion of the divine and human, which finds its completion in the divine origin and person of Christ. The Christian doctrine of a regeneration by the Spirit, the whole tenor of which being so entirely different, cannot have given occasion to the narrative. And still less can it be referred to an over-estimate of the unmarried life; for the gospels presuppose that a real marriage between Mary and Joseph was afterwards consummated. Thus the mythical view is refuted by its internal impossibility.

On the other hand, it may be assumed that the whole course of New Testament development, which leads on from facts to ideas and doctrines, will not prove to have belied itself. Even the conterrering of the name of Jesus is, if not a convincing, yet a supporting proof, of the historical nature of the occurrence. The significance of the fact,—and that it has significance is evident from the “therefore” (*διό*) of Luke i. 35,—lies in its being the starting-point of a new life for mankind, a life of pure humanity. The proportions of the synoptic view have not yet reached the point of the incarnation, nor is absolute sinlessness as yet asserted any more than in the case of Adam. But, by the exclusion of the generative act from the origin, a higher degree of purity was at all events secured for the offspring. The personality, which was thus spared from being interwoven with the continuity of our sinful nature, adopted from it so much only as was homogeneous to its divine origin, and consequently bears within itself a purity and power resulting from the divine consciousness, enabling it to become a new starting-point for humanity. This is the synoptical idea, answering to the Pauline comparison of Christ with Adam, and to his apprehension of Him as the Lord from

heaven (1 Cor. xv. 47), and as the life-giving Spirit (xv. 45, cf. Rom. v. 12 ff.).

The reverse of the generation without paternity is the descent from the race of David. Matthew and Luke give genealogies which aim at proving Jesus to have been descended from David, as in the character of the Messiah He must have been, and also from Abraham as the first recipient of the theocratic promise. But whilst Matthew confines himself to this, Luke goes back to Adam. By connecting Jesus with the first man, he also places Him in historical connection with all mankind, thus proving himself to be a universalist of the Pauline school.

The genealogy of Matthew traces the descent from David through Solomon and familiar royal names; that of Luke, on the other hand, by a series of obscure names through Nathan. The latter has therefore been believed to be a genealogy of Mary,—an opinion the more readily embraced, because it appeared to harmonize better with the story of the conception. An old tradition also speaks of the descent of Mary from David. This explanation, however, does not harmonize with the words in Luke iii. 23, whether Heli be regarded as father-in-law or grandfather. Further, it appears to result from Luke ii. 4 and i. 27 that the evangelist ascribed a descent from David to Joseph only; and, lastly, the genealogy of the mother would, according to Jewish ideas, have had no weight at all. For this very reason, the union of the conception with the genealogy, even if regarded as Joseph's, would be in no way opposed to Jewish views of legitimate descent.

Nor do the two genealogies, even if they both refer to Joseph, exclude each other. Their existence side by side may be explained either by a marriage of two half-brothers, or more simply by assuming that one gives the natural, the second the legal descent through adoption. If we choose the latter supposition, the marriage of Mary as an heiress into the line of David would at any rate help to explain the old tradition of her descent from him. All that has been proved hitherto is that such a mode of reconciling the genealogies is not improbable. Other difficulties remain behind, such as the double mention of Zorobabel, and the omission of the three kings. But the genealogy may still be credible as a whole in spite of these difficulties, especially those of them which arise from the abridgments not unusual in such cases.

Everything combines to prove that the descent of Jesus from

David was not questioned by His contemporaries (cf. Matt. ix. 27, xii. 22 f., xx. 30 f. [Mark x. 47; Luke xviii. 35 ff.], xxi. 9; [Acts ii. 30; Rom. i. 3, ix. 5; 2 Tim. ii. 8; Rev. v. 5, xxii. 16]); nor is His own testimony (Matt. xxii. 41-46) in any way opposed to it. The importance attaching to this feature serves also to explain His acknowledgment as the Messiah; and the fact being once admitted, it became a matter of the deepest moment on historical grounds to trace out and compile the genealogies.

In accordance with a prevailing idea founded on Micah v. 1, Bethlehem was the place of Jesus' birth. This is only mentioned incidentally by Matthew (ch. ii. 1); but Luke states in detail, that Joseph and Mary left Nazareth, their usual abode, and for the purposes of the census travelled to Bethlehem, where the birth took place. The supposition that Nazareth was their earlier dwelling-place is not contradicted by Matthew (ii. 22, 23); for it might very well have been a question with them at that time (having the child-Messiah committed to their care), whether it would not be better for them to live at Bethlehem on account of its near neighbourhood to the sanctuary, and in order to avoid the associations connected with Nazareth. That this is not more plainly expressed is due to the fragmentary nature of the account.

But Luke enters more minutely into particulars, mentioning a Roman census as the occasion of what followed. Now, it has been thought improbable that either of them, and especially Mary, should have gone to the place of their ancestry for such a purpose. Yet recent investigations have shown that among the Romans every one was assessed at the place where he was a municipal freeman; and, moreover, according to later enactments, women of independent fortune were liable to taxation. It is not, however, stated that Mary was obliged to appear: she might have followed so as to avoid being left behind without protection, and exposed to slanderous reports at Nazareth. The question now arises, whether at this time, under the government of Herod, a Roman census could have taken place. This is affirmed by the fact that Augustus left behind him a complete *rationarium* and *breviarium* of the whole empire, which could be based only on a census; that he availed himself of the opportunity to assume universal proconsular power; and that on another occasion exceptions are cited to the universality of such a census, which prove universality to have been the rule.

We are here met by the difficulty that Quirinius (Luke ii. 2) was not proconsul at this time, and that under him undoubtedly a well-known census did take place (mentioned in Acts v. as well as by Josephus), which, however, occurred twelve years later. To avoid the necessity of altering the text, a distinction has been drawn between the planning or beginning of the census, and its actual carrying out or completion; or Quirinius is not considered as proconsul, but only as commissary. But a better expedient than either is to understand *πρώτη* as a comparative, this usage occurring both in Hellenistic and classical Greek. But even then the expression would be ambiguous. Thus much, however, is certain, that Luke, who was very exact in his dates, cannot have mistaken the taxation twelve years later mentioned by himself, and that even a chronological inaccuracy in this respect could not upset the entire fact.¹

It need occasion no surprise that Bethlehem is not mentioned elsewhere in the gospels as our Lord's birthplace. If the contemporaries of Jesus took offence at His being a Nazarene (cf. John vii. 41), the most obvious way of convincing them of His Messiahship would have been to maintain against them the erroneousness of their supposition; but it was much more to His purpose to do this in a different manner. On John i. 46 it is to be observed, that Philip might perhaps not have been aware of the birth in Bethlehem. And, moreover, had prominence been given to this fact in the gospels, critics would no doubt have inferred from it premeditation and untruthfulness.

§ 7. *First coming into public Notice, and early Life.*

Luke relates how the wondrous birth was made known to some shepherds of Bethlehem by a revelation of angels, and subsequently, at the presentation in the temple, to two very aged persons by a spiritual impulse from within. Matthew tells of the appearance of an unusual star, under the influence of which some eastern magi, having arrived at the conviction of the birth of the Messiah, came to do homage to Him.

According to Luke, the announcement was made to the shepherds of Bethlehem in the field by a vision of angels (first, ii. 9, 10, of one; then, 13, 14, of many). The angelic appearance can

¹ [On this vexed and intricate question the treatise of A. W. Zumpt, recently republished in a more complete form, should by all means be consulted.—Tr.]

excite no surprise in those who are at all conversant with the spirit of the Scriptures. The world of spirits is represented throughout the New Testament as forming with mankind the one family of God (Eph. i. 10, [iii. 15 ;] Col. i. 20 ; Luke xv. 10 ; John i. 52). In the present case, the appearance of angels fulfils its loftiest aim, first in the shepherds, whose Messianic faith is proved by their conduct ; next in the parents of Jesus, to whom they impart it ; and lastly in the whole Christian Church which takes part in it. All the circumstances are in harmony with the whole life of Jesus ; and there are no grounds for a mythical hypothesis founded on such inadequate analogies as are afforded by divine appearances to shepherds, and the glorification attending the birth of some great men.

The second announcement is connected with the religious acts which were commanded, partly with reference to the mother, partly to the child (Lev. xii. 2-8 ; Ex. xiii. 2 ; Num. xviii. 15). The child, brought by His mother with this object to Jerusalem, two miles from Bethlehem, was there recognised by Simeon, a very aged man living in constant expectation of the Messiah (whom some without any ground have wished to identify with the father of Gamaliel), and also by an aged prophetess called Anna. No merely natural explanation of this incident will suffice. The whole is brought about by the stirring of the divine Spirit. Susceptibility to impression meets by divine arrangement with a fulfilment, which in the narrative is described as miraculous, by everything being directly traced back to the working of the Holy Spirit. Simeon speaks as one deeply imbued with Messianic aspirations under the Old Testament dispensation ; and the manner in which the widow is introduced is full of historic truth, without a trace of mere embellishment and display. It were a disparagement of individual religious need to misjudge the divine purpose, on account of its limitation to these individuals. Neither the parallel between this scene and that of John's circumcision, nor the desire of glorifying both, will at all explain how the account can have originated in a myth. So far from this, each event bears a construction of its own.

The third announcement differs from the two preceding in referring to heathen,—certain Persian priests and astrologers, for this without doubt the magi were,—who, having had their attention aroused by some celestial phenomenon, inquire after the

Messiah in Jerusalem, are directed to Bethlehem, and there find Him. Messianic hopes had spread from Israel over the whole eastern world. Here they became connected with astrology. These men were led either by an astrological conjecture, or by some extraordinary phenomenon in the heavens; most probably the latter, for there is nothing surprising in the connection of such an appearance with the birth of Jesus. Thus the hopeful forebodings of men in widely different spheres received their fulfilment (Mic. v. 2), and were brought home to expectant hearts. The natural and supernatural react upon each other in every part of this occurrence. What the magi experienced in Jerusalem, and what led them thence to Bethlehem, has a perfectly natural appearance.

Again, the danger and delivery of the young child, which followed these events, form a narrative perfectly consistent in itself, and bearing the stamp of unvarnished history. Certainly some passages from the Old Testament are applied to it by a forced interpretation. This can only be due to the impression made by the facts on the public mind having called forth this interpretation. Here also the supernatural element steps in, but always in harmony with the natural course, as in the dreams which always further the progress of events. The history, too, harmonizes in a singular degree with the well-known cruel and cowardly character of Herod. His calculations, resting on the guileless nature of the magi, and guarding against the possibility of arousing any suspicion in their minds, were perfectly accurate, and must have succeeded but for the divine interposition. Josephus relates nothing of this, as, upon principle, he says nothing about Jesus. Tradition has, indeed, often associated scenes of danger with the early history of great men; but this is no reason why all extraordinary destinies should be untrue. There is nothing in the Old Testament on which such a myth can rest. The whole narrative is so simple and free from all the exaggeration of tradition, that it even gives no intimation of the full signification of the principal event.

The history of the magi is followed by the settled residence of Jesus at Nazareth during His youth. Matthew derives His appellation of Nazarene (ii. 23) from a passage in prophecy, probably referring in his own mind to Isaiah xi., where the Messiah appears as a tender branch [נֶטֶר (*nētsēr*)] springing out of an old and mutilated stem. Jesus dwelling in the dim obscurity of

Nazareth thus appears to the evangelist, who is guided rather by deeper associations of a general prophetic character than by the wording of any particular passage, but still retains the formula of quotation (*διὰ τῶν προφητῶν*). We see, moreover, by his application of Hos. xi. 1, and Jer. xxxi. 15, that he has also in mind a deeper connection and the typical analogy of the sacred history.

Luke mentions the gradual and undisturbed development of the boy, for which the retirement of Nazareth was exactly suited. Some excitement from without may be necessary to the development of a nature even the most original; but the more original a nature is, the better the commonest conditions will suffice. These are here supplied in a pious family life, in the national traditions, and, above all, in the grand revelations of Holy Scripture to which the youthful Jesus had access.

It was perfectly natural for Him to visit the temple in His twelfth year, at which age children were considered old enough to do so; and while there He mixes with the doctors, according to the usual custom of the disciples of the rabbis. In all this, as well as in a moderately wealthy rabbi taking an interest in the child, or even inviting Him to his house, there is nothing at variance with the spirit and customs of the time. The case of Samuel presents only a very general resemblance to this. A peculiar consciousness is shown in the reply of Jesus to His mother, especially on account of the antithetical tone of these words; but He expresses nothing more than perception of a deeply-seated unity with God. Whether the Messianic idea was as yet joined with this in His self-consciousness, is of course uncertain; but that idea is so simple and genuinely human in its universality, that it is difficult to see how it could be absolutely incompatible with the self-consciousness of a child. The narrative is also a voucher for the absence of all special means of cultivation in His earlier years. Even if the term rabbi was subsequently applied to Him from the very commencement of His public life, this proves nothing as to any special education, for any one setting up as a teacher might be so called. *Τέκτων* also may mean carpenter's son, but no objection can be founded upon His having shared Joseph's occupation. Nothing can be more unhistorical than to picture Him in connection with any particular sect.

II. CHRIST'S PREPARATION FOR, AND ENTRANCE UPON, HIS PUBLIC MINISTRY.

§ 8. *Ministry of the Baptist.*

The gospel history was regarded by the evangelists as beginning with that of John the Baptist: this was also the view taken by Jesus Himself (Luke xvi. 16, etc.), and the evangelists therefore gave it an early and prominent place in their accounts (Matt. iii. 1–12; Luke iii. 1–20; Mark i. 1–8). Even John has in effect adopted the same plan, by commencing with the Baptist's testimony of Jesus (John i. 19–37); and his later history is interwoven with the gospel narrative (Matt. xi. 1 ff., xiv. 1 ff.; John iii. 23 ff.). The sources are copious enough; and we have, in addition, the testimony of Josephus for it (*Ant.* 18). Luke only gives also John's early history, the extraordinary events of which are less to be wondered at, if looked upon as showing the divine arrangement, by their suitability both to the existing circumstances and also to the prophecies of the Messiah's forerunner. The early history of John is, besides, so interwoven with that of Jesus, that the two must stand or fall together. The gospels understand his appearance not as something accidental, but as a high necessity attested by Old Testament prophecy. Isaiah (xl. 3) and Malachi (iii. 1, 23) had both predicted the forerunner; and, according to the latter, the expectation of Elias' coming had grown into a popular belief (Matt. xvii. 10; John i. 21). Jesus Himself declares this prophecy to have found its fulfilment in John (Matt. xi. 14, xvii. 12). Before the appearance of the Messiah, the fiery spirit and incorruptible judicial severity of Elias were to recall the people and their leaders to the true meaning and spirit of the old law, and the moral side of the Messianic expectation was thus to be introduced. Such was John's vocation (Matt. xvii. 11), not arbitrarily assumed, but delegated to him expressly from above (Luke iii. 2; John i. 33).

The whole scope of John's preaching was in harmony with this design. By the requirement of repentance, he announced the near approach of the kingdom of God, and also its moral character; showing his insight into the nature and divine economy of this kingdom, by declaring that it did not depend upon descent from Abraham, but upon a moral and religious conversion. In

the universal requirement of repentance he taught the universality of sin, and accordingly depicted the Messiah as the all-searching Judge ; but he applied himself also to the various forms of sin, — to the most deeply seated corruption as well as to the special modes of individual wrong-doing. The Baptist, too, stood forth as the personal embodiment of repentance, and thus strengthened the effect of his exhortations.

His chief course of action was the combination of symbolical baptism with his preaching. The direct and indirect objects of this baptism were, respectively, repentance and the forgiveness of sins. At the same time it pointed to the Messiah ; but, not being effectual for securing the Messianic salvation, merely having been a baptism of water in contradistinction to the baptism of the Spirit, only a symbolical character can attach to it. It was a divine summons to repentance with reference to belief in the Messiah ; and as a personal acknowledgment of the need of redemption, confession of sins was joined with it. If we ask on what grounds the choice of this symbol for the Baptist rested, Jesus Himself (Matt. xxi. 25) points in a sufficiently marked manner to the prophet's divine authorization. But this does not supersede the want of an occasion connecting the rite with some external circumstance. It was long thought that such a link had been discovered in the Jewish custom of baptizing proselytes ; but more careful researches have shown that the existence of this custom cannot be traced back further than the destruction of Jerusalem.¹ Nor would such an origin accord with the intention of John's baptism, which did not involve the idea of admission into a new community. The most probable explanation is, that it was a prophetic-symbolical act, such as we find recorded of prophets in the Old Testament, and connected with a prophetic type of the prior dispensation. The idea of a moral purification was associated with the Messianic times, and this was expressly represented under the form of cleansing with water (cf. Ezek. xxxvi. 25, [xxxvii. 23 ;]

¹ [This assertion can hardly be maintained. The hostility felt by the Jews to Christianity renders it highly improbable that, after the promulgation of the new faith, the Jews should have adopted so distinctively Christian a rite. There is good reason to believe that this simple and natural custom, so prevalent among all the religions of antiquity, was really in use from the captivity, if not, as some think, long before. Cf. Bengel, *das Alte der Jüd. Proselytentaufe*, Tübingen, 1814.—Tr.]

[Jer. xxxi. 31–34;] [Joel iii. 1;] Zech. xiii. 1, [xii. 10]). John embodied this type in the symbolical act of his baptism.

The Messiah, whom John regarded as too high above himself to receive at his hands a service which was too menial even for a disciple to render to his master, is thus depicted by him in relation to His work: (a) As the spiritual Renewer who was to baptize with the Spirit and with fire. The idea of the spiritual baptism was arrived at, by combining the two Old Testament views of the outpouring of the divine Spirit on these times, on the one hand, and with the personal endowment of the Messiah, on the other. (b) A second characteristic of this work is the judgment of the Messiah. This is directly contained only in the synoptic accounts of the Baptist's discourses; yet in John, too, whose narrative, (in part) more copious and therefore more exposed to critical doubt, must always be compared, the same idea is to be found in the exclusion (iii. 36) from life of whosoever does not believe on Him. (c) A third mark follows, occurring only in John, viz. the Messiah's ministry in purifying from sin (John i. 29). The older interpretation here referred to the typical paschal lamb and a sin-offering; to which view it may fairly be objected, that the lamb was not an offering of that kind, although the name of atonement cannot be entirely excluded from it. Against the obscurity of this interpretation must be set the clearness which will result if we find therein an allusion to Isaiah liii. The only question, then, is whether *αἵνειν* means *to take away* merely, or involves also the notion of personal suffering: both which views are in themselves possible. But even in the first case, the taking away would still, according to Isaiah's imagery, be effected by an act of endurance; so that in any case the whole expression contains the idea of a purification from sin through suffering, since a third explanation, that of bearing suffering (*ἁμαρτία*), is impossible. This idea, however, John must have already arrived at through his own baptisms, the very intention of which was to prepare the way by repentance for the forgiveness of sins, which was to be attained only through the Messiah. And even if John afterwards entertained any doubt as to the character of Jesus, nothing more is implied than his inability to account for the delay in the Messiah's work. For a proper idea as to Jesus had certainly not become familiar to the people; and the disciples of John, and even of Jesus, might not have attained to it.

As to the person of Jesus, we have some express declarations of the Baptist in John's Gospel. The first of these occurs at i. 27 and 30, where His pre-existence is declared certainly in *πρῶτος*, and probably in *ἔμπροσθεν* also; for the latter can scarcely be interpreted to mean no more than pre-eminence, the succeeding clause with *ὅτι* being merely explanatory. The material for this view of the Baptist is to be found in the 7th chapter of Daniel, and also in the 5th of Micah, which at least admits of such an interpretation; and, finally, in the many passages where the coming of the Messiah is represented as the complete manifestation of Deity, which might easily result in the recognition of a deeper relation between His person and God Himself. Here, then, we have merely a recapitulation in its more spiritual features of what was foreshadowed in the Old Testament, and one which first explains to us John's depreciation of himself as compared with Jesus, as recorded by the synoptic evangelists. Another passage (John iii. 32-36) presents greater difficulty, because it is an open question whether the evangelist or the Baptist is speaking. The former view appears to be favoured by the fact, that from the 32d verse onwards the personal mode of expression is not adopted; that the paragraph contains some expressions (as *ἀνωθεν ἐρχόμενος*) which elsewhere occur from the lips of Jesus; and lastly, that the thoughts contained from ver. 32b would not be expected from the Baptist at this juncture. On the other hand, the mention of the Spirit (ver. 34), and of the wrath of God (ver. 36), does not harmonize so well with the evangelist's range of thought, as with that of the Baptist from his purely prophetic point of view. The opinions expressed are, doubtless, mainly those of the Baptist, possibly with some colouring of the evangelist's own views, but in all essential points true to their original.

Preaching of this kind, enforced by the whole bearing of the man breathing the spirit of ancient prophecy, and standing out in sharp opposition to the manners of the age, produced a great popular excitement quite sufficient to account for the deputation of the Sanhedrim mentioned by the evangelist (John i. 19). But although John could not fail to draw down upon him the public notice of the governing body, his views, especially his apprehension of the Messiah, were not yet so decidedly developed as to allow them to take in at first sight the distance which really lay between the Baptist's sphere of thought and their own. The

impression he made, however, although it procured him some real enemies (Matt. xxi. 24 ff.; Luke vii. 30), led also, as is specially mentioned by Luke (iii. 15), to some genuine feeling of expectation. It is true, indeed, that there were many—the Pharisees especially—who took no part in it (Matt. xxi. 24 ff.); and even his own disciples, whom he had under special instruction (John i. 35, iii. 25 ff.; Matt. ix. 14; Luke xi. 1), could not in all cases reach his standpoint, and were on that very account unable for a time to accept Jesus as the Messiah (Matt. xi. 2 ff.; Acts xix. 1 ff.),—yet the more thoughtful amongst them found no difficulty afterwards in becoming disciples of Jesus (John i. 35 ff.). And in the fact of many of the inhabitants of Perea going forth of their own accord to meet Him (John x. 40 ff.), we see an afterworking of the first lively impression made by John's preaching. How John gradually moved out of Perea into Herod's dominion, rebuked his sins, and hereupon was first detained prisoner with a certain amount of liberty, and then sacrificed by Herod, is known from the gospels, and corroborated by Josephus, since the reason he gives for Herod's conduct,—viz. that the king feared the influence of the Baptist upon the people,—is a natural complement of the other. It was through this influence that the censor of morals would first be thought dangerous.

§ 9. *Personal Relation of the Baptist to Jesus.*

Jesus and the Baptist were contemporary; and the statements in Luke as to the appearance of both in public quite harmonize with what we know about the time of the birth of each. The difference of a year or less in their entrance upon public life is quite sufficient to account for all that was done by John before the appearance of Jesus. Their work was still for a time contemporaneous; and if in Matthew and Mark John the Baptist appears to have been thrown into prison before Jesus began His work in Galilee, this must be understood of His second sojourn there, which is later than that recorded in John ii. The relationship of their mothers allows us to suppose that they were personally known to each other; but whether any closer intimacy existed between them is uncertain, and John's Nazarite vows make rather against such a supposition. At the baptism, it is shown (Matt. iii. 13–15) that John knew Jesus even on the side of His spiritual and moral personality; but an insight into

our Lord's Messianic vocation, or at least the divine certainty on the point, was not opened to him until after that event, and in this sense he had not before known Him (John i. 33). Their first meeting, as well as their subsequent conduct, claims for both of them a completely independent and self-reliant position. Each follows his own divinely appointed calling. Jesus was no disciple of John; nothing was concerted between them; and John still pursued his own course, even after his meeting with our Lord.

The fourth gospel alone relates that John expressly bore witness to Jesus as the Messiah in familiar intercourse with his own disciples (John i. 29 ff.). That the Synoptists do not mention this is sufficiently explained by their plan: in them the history of the Baptist is made to precede the public appearance of Jesus, whilst in the fourth gospel it is from the very first interwoven with the texture of the narrative. Notwithstanding that testimony, the Baptist did not attach himself to Jesus; so long as men had to be prepared for the coming of the Messiah, his special vocation also continued. He remained a prophet, although gifted with the clearest prophetic view of the immediately pending fulfilment; and, consistently with his pure moral character, he readily subordinated himself to the higher and freer spirit. But as soon as John came to regard his imprisonment as the divinely appointed limit to his mission, he expected the immediate public appearance of the Messiah, and the rapid development of powerful attestations of His work. And when appearances seemed rather to belie this expectation, the dark stillness of his dungeon called up doubts in the prophet's mind, and he sent to demand from Jesus Himself the solution of the difficulty; but at the same time that he put the question, bore witness that his confidence was not yet extinct (Matt. xi. 2 ff.).

As John bore witness to Jesus, so did Jesus testify of him before the people and His disciples as His forerunner and the promised Elias (Matt. xi. 11 ff., xvii. 11-13). In the first passage He declares him to be, if not the greatest prophet, at least surpassed by none, but yet inferior to any member of the heavenly kingdom: this expression, however, does not exclude John from all knowledge of Jesus and the gospel. It is plain that our Lord presupposes John's divine calling, since He (Matt. xxi. 25-27) refers the chiefs of the people to it. In John v. 33 He appeals from the Jews to John's witness, but not as to his

highest testimony. It is evident that He does not rest upon this alone, His consciousness having a different basis; but He attaches importance to it solely on the Jews' account. And this is no less in accordance with the position of the forerunner as an integral member of the history of Jesus, than it is consistent with the independence of both.

This historical conception of the gospels is best attested by the fact of its essential correspondence with the Old and New Testament dispensations, as well as with the historical relations. The appearance of Jesus would, but for this, be an accidental and isolated fact, and that of the Baptist alone both obscure and purposeless. Christianity was based upon, and predicted in, the Old Testament; and their intimate connection was stamped at the very beginning of the gospel by the appearance of a great restorer of the law. This is according to nature, and thus God works in history.

§ 10. *The Baptism of Jesus.*

Matt. iii. 13-17; Mark i. 9-11; Luke iii. 21, 22; John i. 31-34. The fact is related only by the synoptic evangelists, because John's narrative begins at a later period, but he also plainly alludes to it. The fact of Jesus having submitted to this baptism loses all its obscurity and its apparent opposition to His Messianic consciousness, if we rightly understand how His will was kept in subordination to the divine preparation for the development of His life, and also regard the rite itself as something different from a baptism of repentance. This baptism was rather a divinely ordered preparation for the introduction of the Messiah's kingdom, and therefore subjectively a declaration of willingness to take part in it. This declaration it was both possible and necessary for Jesus to take part in. Herein He fulfils all righteousness (*δικαιοσύνη*), although He was of course exempted from the confession of repentance. And here we have the explanation of John's scruples, who indeed expected Him at His preparatory baptism, but failed to penetrate the reason of His participation in it. But it was nothing less than our Lord's Messianic consciousness that brought Him to the Baptist, whereby He saw clearly that the time and manner of His public manifestation were not left to His own choice. He therefore resigned His will entirely to the Father's keeping, and thus submitted to baptism as much for His own sake as for the effect of His example upon the multitude.

With this baptism, however, is closely connected a miraculous phenomenon, the opening of heaven, the descent of the Spirit on Jesus in the form of a dove, and the testifying voice from on high. Matthew and Mark describe this as a vision seen by Jesus; John gives it as the experience of the Baptist, his object being to relate the testimony of the latter which resulted from it rather than to record the fact itself. But none of the accounts exclude the further manifestation which might be shared by the people. Luke represents the occurrence for the most part in a purely objective manner. That a miraculous event is in question cannot be doubted. Some have thought this miracle opposed to educated conceptions of God and heaven. But, inasmuch as the evangelist John, whose idea of God is of the purest kind, has not taken offence at it, the whole need not necessarily be regarded merely as an inward vision, against which idea the accounts speak pretty clearly. We must, however, regard the vision as of a symbolical character, in which case there is nothing repugnant either in the heaven cleft as it were with dazzling brightness, or in the form of the emblematic dove, or in the voice from heaven. But although presumptions derived from the Old Testament cannot fail to be applied to the occurrence and its consequences, they are totally inadequate to account for a poetical origin of the narrative. Least of all can this be explained by the wish of Judaizing Christians to make out that Jesus then first became the Messiah. In the Ebionite account of the matter, as we know it through the fathers, the Bible narrative has been evidently transformed and dressed up to further the peculiar dogmas of that sect.

Jesus did not arrive at His Messianic consciousness through His baptism and its attendant miracle. If He always possessed this, its development was identical with that of His personal self-consciousness, as is evident from the occurrence in His twelfth year. The natural bringing about of that development lay in His intimate acquaintance with the divine word on the one side, and with the human race and its need of redemption on the other. For the Baptist himself, and through him for the people also, the baptismal miracle was the unveiling of the Messianic person of Jesus, and consequently the culminating point of John's baptism, as well as the decisive turning-point for the beginning of the Messianic kingdom. It was also the sign by which Jesus would recognise the commencement of His Messianic activity: it was

for Him the word of the Father pointing out His path,—of the Father who reserved to Himself to determine the epochs of His kingdom (Mark xiii. 32; Acts i. 7). But with this was doubtless also connected an inner operation, a change in our Lord's consciousness. The anointing with the Holy Ghost is only a general expression for this. He had the Messianic consciousness: He knew Himself to be sinless and in unity with God in a way which distinguished Him from all other men. But there might be something still wanting to the activity of His Messianic consciousness. This is the perception of the explicit existence of His Messianic power. The Word made flesh may easily be conceived apart from His stepping forth thus into public life and action. And with this something new springs up within Him; and just as external, no less than internal, causes contribute to every kind of natural development, so in this case also divine influence from without must needs be exerted, through which His latent Messiahship was roused into activity. In this public manifestation it assumes the decidedly prophetic form; and the descent upon Jesus of the Spirit of prophecy constitutes this stage in the development of the God-man's personality.

§ 11. *The Temptation of Jesus.*

There is an internal connection, independent of mere sequence, between the baptism of Jesus and His temptation (Matt. iv. 1 ff.; Mark i. 12 f.; Luke iv. 1 ff.); for it is the Spirit which came upon Him on the former occasion that leads Him into the wilderness. Ere He makes His public appearance, He must first be inwardly proved to be the active Messiah. The temptation thus belongs to His Messianic position. But this act of temporary seclusion may be explained equally well on psychological grounds. After the consecration, a season of earnest contemplation must precede the Messianic activity He has now assumed. With this is connected fasting, as a help to contemplation and undisturbed communion with God. That it is a partial fast appears from a comparison of several passages, such as Matt. xi. 18, cf. iii. 4; Luke vii. 33; Acts xxvii. 33. The solitude brings home to Him the position in which He stands as the Messiah, alone, and destitute of all human aid. Hence the features of Mark's account (i. 13). Here there is nothing accidental, but everything is brought about in accordance with a higher divine necessity. But

the evangelists are consciously giving a history of what really occurred. Thus they represent it, and assign it its proper place in relation to their whole statement. By them, at all events, it was regarded as a fact. John's account does not begin until after all this had occurred.

But although the evangelists represent what they are relating as a real event, it still remains an open question whether it was an external or an internal one. This much, at any rate, is certain, that on the latter supposition the subjective origin of the temptation must be ascribed to Satan, since it cannot possibly be supposed to have arisen in the person of Jesus. We must absolutely reject the view that it was a mere inward operation, a mere conflict of opposing thoughts in the growing mind of Jesus Himself. The assumption of a dream is equally unsupported in the text. The theory of a vision wrought by Satan has more probability, and even finds some support in the narrative, because an external manifestation of the person of Satan is unprecedented elsewhere in the sacred history, and because the change of localities in the temptation may be thought to present difficulty if regarded as an actual occurrence. This, indeed, applies particularly to the exhibition of all the kingdoms of the world in a moment of time, which can hardly be regarded as a literal fact, unless we suppose a vision to have added completeness to it. The fact of Jesus being led by the Spirit into the wilderness has also been interpreted in the same way. We are not, however, tied down to this view in either case, particularly as at other times Jesus Himself comes into supernatural contact with the spirit-world, as was the case at the transfiguration and in Gethsemane; and also that Satan, if he exists, must also be capable of becoming visible. The possibility still remains that, in the intention of the evangelists, the event may have rested not on any outward and material perception, but on an internal view, of such a kind, however, as not to interfere with the objective reality of the temptation.

The acts of the temptation itself are three. The tempter assails Jesus in the threefold tendency of the universally prevailing impulses in human nature—the love of life, the desire for honour, and the thirst for rule and acquisition. The temptation has accordingly for its objects ungodly enjoyment, the tempting of God, and self-seeking in its most perfect form; and so far is a moral trial universally applicable to human nature. The first

temptation was connected with a real need, and was intended to cause Jesus to forsake His earthly vocation of suffering. The object of the second was to induce Him to allow Himself to be singled out as the object of God's special care in a danger of His own seeking. The resources of individual temptation being exhausted, it remained only to present to Him all the splendour of world-wide dominion; but here, too, Satan must needs manifest himself in his true character, by exacting divine homage. Jesus repelled him with the fundamental principle on which the Old and New Testament alike rest. Step by step had He unmasked the evil designs of the tempter, and at length opposed him with indignation. Two points may be observed in the twofold character of the temptation. In the first place, Jesus remained free from all evil inclination within, and was only accessible to temptation from without. He was, too, throughout conscious of its complete opposition to the divine order of things. Added to this, the fact that neither His understanding nor His will for a moment faltered, sufficiently proves the incorruptibility of His nature. Moreover, upon this discomfiture of the tempter a threefold principle is stamped, which we see running through the whole of our Lord's Messianic life: (1) never to employ the power which He possessed in that character for His own advantage; (2) never arbitrarily to challenge extraordinary divine assistance; and (3) never to make the least concession to the kingdom of darkness for the sake of attaining what seemed to be the most brilliant result.

The unhistorical view of the temptation explains it partly as a parable, and partly as a myth. The first view is not only unsupported by the narrative itself, but all analogy forbids us to believe that without a figure Jesus would introduce His own person in a parable. Nor is it much easier to admit that limitation of the historical sense, according to which Jesus related parabolically a real inward occurrence which was historically misunderstood by His disciples; for this would be to regard Jesus as the author of such misapprehension, as He Himself on other occasions speaks of Satan objectively and didactically. It was, however, the reluctance to the embodiment of Satan which gave rise to this expedient. But in the distinctive teaching of Jesus this reluctance finds no support, and cannot therefore impel us to the mythical view which is derived from it. The explanation of the narrative as a myth involves considerable difficulties resting on external points. The

occasion and purpose of the forty days spent by Moses and Elias in the wilderness were both different ; and the fact of this number being of old customary among the people, only shows that as a round number it might easily be applied to the narrative of this event. But not only is the Satanic temptation of the Messiah, which is the leading idea, without parallel in the Old Testament and the Jewish consciousness, but there are also certain indications that in the latter it would have been inadmissible. For, on the one hand, they conceived too highly of the Messiah ; and, on the other, they regarded Him only as the outward conqueror of Satanic power, and that not in a mere ethical conflict. Neither can the purport of the individual temptations be derived from the Old Testament parallel of the temptation of the people in the wilderness, the second and third temptations especially ; but, in the case of the first also, the similarity is only apparent, inasmuch as with Jesus the fact of hunger is merely incidental, the temptation essentially turning upon the working of miracles. The historical truth of the narrative is further confirmed by the complete harmony between the conduct of Jesus and the general scope of His teaching ; which harmony rivets the whole upon Himself. This conclusion is confirmed if we inquire where the myth, if such it be, can have originated. Not certainly in a circle biassed by Jewish prejudice ; for the views presented by the tempter lay closer to the sentiment of that people than the ethical ideal of the Messiah emanating from Jesus Himself. Consequently the myth could have proceeded from no other source than a narrow apostolical circle ; and here again such a violation of historical truth is inconceivable. Doubtless Jesus Himself imparted the history, hardly not till after the resurrection, as has been supposed, but on such occasions as Matt. xvi. 21 ff. As it is a fragmentary statement, He may perhaps have chosen from the temptations to which He had been exposed, the three in which the leading principles of His Messianic working were embodied.

The event itself possesses both a dogmatic and an historico-dogmatic significance. With respect to the first, it proclaims in Jesus His true but sinless humanity, and the also purely divine and no less purely human character of His work. The susceptibility to temptation is a point in the progressive development of His life, at which its whole spiritual capacity must be gradually

absorbed in His divine life. Over against Him stands the world and sin concentrated in the person of Satan, who here comes in as the tempter of the second Adam, as he had once before done at the fall of the first, striving in both cases to frustrate the work of God, truth and righteousness in mankind.

Historico-dogmatically the narrative indicates the time at which the idea of the Messianic work, which Jesus was now on the point of realizing, assumed within Him the form of a completed moral fact. And thus the baptism and the temptation (the consecration of the Messiah, the proving of the Messiah) may be regarded together as the starting-point and type of His public life just then commencing. In the one case, we have the manifestation of the Son's divinity in the person of Jesus, and His complete subjection to the Father; in the other, the most determined opposition to the spirit of the world, set forth in action by His persistence in the divine will. And thus both accounts become not heterogeneous, but homogeneous elements in the evangelical history; and their omission by St. John (apart from their being excluded by the late commencement of his history) need cause no surprise, if we consider the decided way in which he gives expression to the consciousness possessed by Jesus, of the active opposition of Satan to His person and His work (John xiv. 30).

III. THE PUBLIC CAREER OF JESUS.

§ 12. *Jesus' Plan.*

In applying the word "plan" to the course which Jesus pursued, we must be careful to avoid the notion of anything arbitrarily fabricated, or generally resulting from His own inward reflection. The ministry of Jesus was the unfolding of His personality; but, by His grasping in the requisite manner that which was inherent in Him, it assumed in Him the shape of definite thought, and the work before Him became a decided resolution. Using the word "plan" with the above limitation, we shall avoid the error of applying it to any abstraction such as the kingdom of truth and virtue, but shall take it as referring to the definite position in which the self-consciousness of Jesus stood to mankind of a certain race and at a particular time. The development and guidance for thousands of years, firstly of the Israelitish

people, and indirectly of the whole human race, prepared the way for His work. His plan was therefore of a Messianic character. He has Himself declared as much by His connection with John the Baptist, by declaring Himself as the Messiah before the people (Matt. xxi. 15, 16), before individuals (John iv. 26, ix. 37, x. 25), and before the tribunal of judgment (John xviii. 37; Matt. xxvi. 64), as well as by the result of these declarations in the acknowledgment of the disciples after His death.

The only point of difficulty here is, to determine how soon He declared Himself as the Messiah (cf. § 30). In consequence, as is asserted, of John differing from the Synoptists, as well as the supposed uncertainty of their statements, it has been inferred that Jesus did not until a late period fully comprehend Himself as the Messiah (Matt. xvi.); that He was at first, perhaps, only a disciple of the Baptist, and then only timidly and gradually appropriated the Messianic idea to Himself, forbidding, and being alarmed at, its expression on the part of others. In this way also have been explained the different views into which popular opinion diverged concerning Him, the more decided declarations of His character having been transferred, as is supposed, to an earlier period by mistake. But the hypothesis is erroneous, both that the declarations of Jesus as recorded by St. John, and also that the demeanour of men towards Him, were from the beginning fixed and invariable. What at first brought disciples to Him was merely the testimony of the Baptist; and then undoubtedly the powerful impression produced by His own person, which nevertheless He confirmed in those who came to Him, not by any actual testimony to His Messiahship, but only by hinting at the incomparable height of His majesty (John i. 51), of which they were soon to have other and different proofs. Appeals of this kind, however, were only made to individuals peculiarly susceptible of them. He comported Himself differently before a mixed multitude. He performed miracles in Galilee, but did not declare Himself to be the Messiah; and similarly at Jerusalem He gave the sign of the cleansing of the temple, but what He said of His own person was still veiled in darkness; and, indeed, it is expressly stated that He did not confide in them, because He knew what was in them (John ii. 24). He behaved differently in Samaria (ch. iv.), where He was again met by a more open susceptibility, and the Jewish idea of a political Messiah did not confront Him. But to the

Jews in Galilee and Judea He always speaks with the greatest reserve as to the Messianic idea. In the 9th chapter we see Him after the miracle of feeding withdraw Himself from the excited multitude. He certainly speaks of the sublimity of His person and mission, but at the same time keeps the Messianic idea in the background, and clothes His discourse in an intentional obscurity. Everything, including the mention of His death, points to the idea of a spiritual aim, and is, in short, rather repellent to the general multitude. The same reserve already shown to Nicodemus, Jesus expressly manifests on principle in dealing with questions and appeals on the subject of His Messiahship, both from His own disciples (John vii. 2 and sq.), and from the people (x. 24, and cf. vii. 40). This procedure formed part of His plan. In Galilee He necessarily shunned the danger of fostering the idea of a political Messiah, and of bringing on in Jerusalem a premature catastrophe; and the conduct of the disciples (Matt. xvi.) is quite in accordance with that of their Master in this respect. Peter's confession was no fresh rising light, but the concentration of all the rays which had hitherto shone upon them; and was brought about by Jesus as a conscious confirmation of their faith against the shifting opinions of the multitude. If public opinion still continued to fluctuate concerning Him, this is accounted for not by any uncertainty in His own conduct, but simply by the fact that the people expected quite a different Messiah,—not a prophet going about the country teaching and working miracles, but one who would seize the reins of government. From all this we may conclude that Jesus, in unveiling His Messianic dignity, observed that wisdom without which His plan could not (humanly speaking) have succeeded. Nowhere, however, from the very first does He decline to acknowledge His Messiahship, but rather admits it on every occasion (Matt. viii. 10–13, 29–32, ix. 18–26, 27–29, xii. 23 f.). From the very first He gives Himself out as the Messiah, most decidedly in the sermon on the Mount, and in the discourse about John (Matt. xi. 12 ff.); but at the same time the confession of Him must grow out of the contemplation of His deeds, for no otherwise could it rest upon its true inward foundation. Even when He forbade the blazing abroad of isolated deeds, no inward uncertainty is implied, but, on the contrary, the most decisive self-consciousness which employs wise reserve as circumstances may require, either to

prevent a momentary success only injurious to the true aim of His ministry, or to lead those whom He healed to commune with their own hearts, whenever loud rejoicing might have made any deeper influence within them impossible. This intention is most plainly seen in the prohibition which followed His Transfiguration. Thus, then, everything leads us to the conclusion that, although Jesus from the first apprehended His work as Messianic, He was yet most carefully on His guard against allowing it to fall in with the Messianic ideas of the time, and thus to cloud the purity of His intentions. The more decidedly we can trace this purpose, and the perfect discretion and self-denial which it gave rise to, so much the more certain is it that from the very first He was at full accord with Himself on the point.

The very opposition in which He thus placed Himself excludes the idea of any purely political scheme on His part, such as some, violating all history both of the gospel and the world, would have wished to ascribe to Him. The whole spirit of His life-teaching and ministry, no less than of His suffering and death, is against it. There is no trace of political manœuvre of any kind: the choice of His apostles and disciples was clearly opposed to the idea. His last entrance into Jerusalem was not, indeed, a purely accidental circumstance, but intentionally pre-arranged, but yet is of an entirely symbolical and prophetic character. He thus essayed the last solemn impression of His person upon the people, but with no political design, since He entered only to work as a prophet by word and deed in the city and in the temple. But it has been said that although Jesus did not Himself wish to precipitate the catastrophe—the restoration of the throne of David—by external violence, He yet expected it to be brought about by divine arrangement through the interposition of angels and higher powers. But the dominion which Jesus expected (Matt. xix. 28; Luke xxii. 30) was a renewal of the world, called by Matthew *παλιγγενεσία*, which comprehends the resurrection, into the *αἶὼν μέλλων*, in which, according to Luke (xx. 35, 36), men shall be as angels. This surely is no political expectation. Moreover (Matt. xxvi. 53), Jesus does not say that He expects angels, but just the contrary. He could ask for them, but then the Scripture would not be fulfilled (Matt. xvi. 27, xxiv. 30, 31, xxv. 31). The expected angelic appearances themselves are far from having anything in common with the aims of worldly

policy; and these are absolutely excluded by the fact that He looks for the inauguration of His kingdom at a time when His own suffering and death are presupposed (Luke xvii. 25; Matt. xvi. 27, 28, 21, xxiv., xxv., xxvi. 1 ff.). It is this expectation also which forbids our limiting His plan to a moral, and consequently external, regeneration of His nation; and the testimony we possess to the universality of this renewal, no less than the decided expectation of the fall of the Jewish nation, are equally opposed to any such limitation. An attempt has been made to vindicate the political side of Jesus' plan, by assuming that in this respect His life is divisible into two periods. According to this view, His original purpose was to found a theocratic kingdom by spiritual means; but this object He afterwards relinquished. Above all, a great contrast is pointed out between the cheerful, and the melancholy frame of mind which characterized the earlier and later portions of His life respectively. The contrast between earlier cheerfulness and later melancholy is not very well defined; compare only Matt. xi. 25-30, and also 20-24. And how clearly, according to Matthew (ch. xiii.), He represented the diverse effects of His word and everything connected with it even at an early period; and in the sermon on the Mount He foretold the persecution of His disciples; and in the conversation with Nicodemus He spoke of His death (cf. § 13, 1). Hence these ideas fall by their own weakness, since, as regards the assumption on which they rest, no trace of the existence of such periods is to be found in the evangelists.

What Jesus had in view was, therefore, the foundation of God's kingdom as identical with the work of redemption (cf. § 39). In the sermon on the Mount, this kingdom was represented as the kernel and substance of His work, and is so far ethical in its character. And if this idea is not placed so prominently in the foreground in the discourses chosen by John, it is nevertheless borne ample witness to as a central idea in the conversation with Nicodemus and in the answer to Pilate. His aim was a spiritual and universal kingdom, as the consideration of His teaching on the subject must show. And the cases of the centurion and of the Samaritan woman go to prove that His only reason for limiting His own operations, and, at first, those of the disciples, to the Jewish nation, was to gain a firm foothold and starting-point for His entire scheme; but that He turned to the Gentile world

wherever it could be done without hindrance to His higher aims. His commission to preach to the whole world is quite consistent with the fact that His disciples, even after His death, only gradually learned to fulfil it. Their prejudice was merely that the Gentile world, in order to have a share in God's kingdom, must allow themselves to be admitted into the theocratic union. This theocratic union prescribed in the old covenant He Himself did not as yet desire to dissolve, but rather to fulfil. He does not, therefore, set Himself in revolutionary opposition to it; indeed, keeps the law in His own person, seeing that the old covenant remains in force until superseded by the new, which it could not be until after His death. His task was from the national form to develop the eternal purport of the Jewish law; and His own general expressions as to the object of His life identify it partly with the spiritual deliverance of the sinner, partly with the establishment of God's kingdom. Both are united by the doctrine that repentance or moral renewal is the condition of participation in the kingdom of God. Thus it is represented in the Synoptists; and according to this, Jesus collects believers around Him, and urges them to union with Himself. He seeks to awaken them to a sense of their moral need, and attaches Himself most closely to those who give the clearest tokens of it. His person appears still more in the foreground in John's Gospel, because His actions are there represented rather in their life-giving than in their saving aspect, and He is thus their positive central-point. The fact of His person and its manifestation being the most important incidents in the scheme, proves the significance of the proposition that we must not attempt to take an abstract view of it. Not only must we hold firmly to its historical foundation, but also to the identity of Jesus' work with His historical appearance as that of the divine life in mankind. The universal and essential spirituality of His plan, taken in connection with its entire dependence on His person, gives it a perfectly unique character. No founder of a new religion, no lawgiver, no philosopher, has ever appeared with such an entirely universal aim, for none could ever believe that he could redeem mankind. History abounds with great projects of great men; but the idea of the redemption of a world, as it was realized in Him, stands absolutely alone: it could only have proceeded from one whose nature was exalted far above humanity.

§ 13. *Execution of the Plan.*

In speaking of the difficulties of this plan, it must be borne in mind that Jesus was Himself perfectly aware of them, and also that the word is in its strict sense inapplicable, since the so-called difficulties were included in the necessity of the divine scheme, and belonged to the scope and tenor of the plan itself. Having the deepest insight into human nature, He could not be deceived as to the kind of reception which awaited Him. But deeper still lay the knowledge of His intent to redeem the world. He therefore sets Himself and His mission in direct antagonism to it, and regards the defeat of its opposition as His peculiar task. His view of this opposition was, however, most comprehensive. According to the parables in Matt. xiii., He foresaw not only that His word would meet with a very unequal reception in the field of the world, but also that the mass even of those who received it would retain its heterogeneous character, and that no separation of true believers before the judgment was advisable. He foresaw, too, that the progress of His work, where it made any, would be slow and gradual; and, in accordance with these prospects, He early prophesied His own death, and predicted to His disciples the hatred of the world; as, for instance, in the sermon on the Mount, and in the charge He gave to His disciples (Matt. x.). Thus He invited those who would follow Him to take up their cross and deny themselves (Matt. xvi. 24, cf. Luke xii. 50 ff., xxi. 16, 17; John xv. 19, 20, etc.). With the clearest consciousness He sees consummated in Himself and in His work, the same opposition which the old covenant also had to encounter in the world (Matt. v. 12; Luke xiii. 34; Matt. xxii. 29, 32 ff.).

Jesus' plan could only be carried into effect by the framer of it being also the divine Redeemer and one with the Father, as represented by the evangelists; and then the plan is merely the revelation, and its execution the development, of His own being. And so it appears throughout the gospel history. Thus He invites (Matt. xi. 25-30) the weary and heavy-laden to Himself, but refers to the fact that the Father has committed all things into His hands, and that He knows Him. So also in John xvii. Hence the discourses which relate to the development and completion of the kingdom of God refer also to His second coming, because the completion of His work is identical with the gradual unveiling of

His person. The more inseparable His work is from His person, the less ground there is for the assertion that He relied upon the ethical force of what He did, which force would continue to operate without the influence of His life and name. On the contrary, He lived in the conviction of the abiding continuance of His name.

The hypothesis that Jesus was connected with, or at the head of, a secret society, carries with it its own overthrow. For no traces of such a society are to be found in Palestine, with the exception of the Essenes (and with them Christianity has nothing in common as regards its origin), a sect characterized by an ideal and reformatory character. But whereas the fundamental principle amongst the Essenes was obedience, not to the Levitical law, but to an ascetic rule peculiar to themselves, the spirit of freedom, which is the very essence of Christianity, finds no explanation amongst them. There is another important difference between Christianity and the Essenes, the latter, as it appears, excluding any idea of a Messiah. And besides this, the supposition of a secret society finds no support in the gospel history. The conduct of Jesus is throughout entirely open. The fact that He frequently sought solitude, and that Nicodemus came to Him by night, may be otherwise explained. His every step was soon watched and scanned with hostile intent; yet there is no trace of any secret system of instruction or discourse. Matt. x. 27 treats of the unveiling of what had up to that time been hidden (cf. also ch. xiii.).

In John xviii. 20, He refers to the publicity of His office as our instructor; and He draws the attention of His disciples to this (Matt. x. 26, 27 (cf. v. 14-16); Luke xii. 3). In accordance with this, too, they lived and acted after His death.

Thus, then, His ministry consisted in His prophetic life and in His death, which was thereafter to be accomplished.

IV. EXTERNAL VIEW OF HIS PUBLIC MINISTRY.

§ 14. *Choice and Education of the Disciples.*

The synoptic accounts represent the public ministry of Jesus to have begun after the temptation, and almost immediately upon the imprisonment of John the Baptist, when Jesus withdrew into Galilee (Matt. iv. 12). This was no doubt His second visit

thither, preceding a short stay in Galilee, during which the miracle at Cana occurred, as well as a sojourn at Jerusalem, when He purified the temple, and in Judea generally, where His disciples met with John; all these incidents being related by the fourth evangelist. The synoptic statement mentions only one visit of Jesus to Jerusalem, at the last passover; whereas, according to John, He was often there. This is explained by supposing that Matthew's scheme was the groundwork for the others (cf. § 3). The latter, however, was called to the apostleship later than others (ix. 9, cf. iv. 22), and he, as well as the others, record a temporary absence of the disciples (Matt. x.; Mark vi. 7-13). Jesus might well have repaired to Jerusalem at such a time accompanied by a select few; and this is rendered more probable by comparing Luke ix. 12 with John vi., according to which the miracle of feeding was preceded by a temporary absence of the disciples, as well as by a sojourn of Jesus in Jerusalem. The Synoptists, and Matthew especially, only follow the chronological order so far as to make the end develope itself from a certain point (Matt. xvi.), the earlier discourses as preparatory to this being clearly distinguished from the later. Distinctly marked chronological periods are found in John only, who mentions altogether three passovers (ii. 13, vi. 4, and xi. 55 [xii. 1 ff.]). The feast mentioned at v. 1 is certainly not a passover; and from this results a period of two years and a few months, in which Jesus' public ministry is comprehended. Jesus spent the greater part of this time in Galilee, a half-heathen district, which He no doubt chose on account of the powerful race who dwelt there, and because the inhabitants being less exposed to pharisaic influences, He was safer there from insidious attacks. On the other hand, the disaffection which prevailed there demanded greater caution in unveiling His Messianic purposes. It is hardly necessary to take into account the short sojourns in Samaria (John iv.), and in Syrophenicia (Matt. xv.). Herein Jesus acted on the principle pronounced in Matt. x. 5. A longer time, on the whole, is allotted to Judea and Jerusalem; for, although we cannot determine certainly how long He stayed there after the first passover, it appears, from a hint in His conversation with the Samaritan woman, to have been late in the autumn when He returned into Galilee. Some part of the second year, before the third passover, was spent in Perea (Matt. xix.; Mark x.; John x. 40-42); and in the interval Jesus attended several feasts at

Jerusalem, of which John mentions that of tabernacles (vii.), and of the dedication (x.) in the winter. Add to this the time of His sojourn at Jerusalem during the unknown feast, and at least a year remains for the duration of His active life in Galilee. This also explains the partial view of Christian antiquity derived from the synoptic account, that the whole of Jesus' public ministry lasted only one year, thus excluding the times of His attendance at the feasts. There are, however, some traces even in the Synoptists of an earlier sojourn in Jerusalem, before the final one (see § 3).

Although Jesus selected Capernaum especially as the scene of His ministry, yet He also passed through Galilee in various directions, and made use of the institutions of the synagogue for giving lectures on the Sabbath. But, not limiting Himself to this, He taught in the open air, on the sea-shore, from a mountain, etc. Add to these His operations in Jerusalem, where at the feast He met with His countrymen coming from foreign countries (the "*Έλληνες*", for instance, at the last passover), and could thus extend the sphere of His labours without abandoning the Jews as the primary objects of His mission. The general character of His ministry was the prophetic declaration of the divine will and counsel distinctly interpreted and forcibly applied. He came to announce the divine decree for the establishment of a new and different theocracy. For this very reason, it was not a question of raising the Jewish people at any fixed date above the position they had attained, or to help them over a difficult crisis in their history. His object was to complete what had been in preparation during the whole of the foregoing dispensation, and, by breaking through its husk of exclusiveness, to help into full and universal development the now well-matured germ which lay as a kernel within it. The form, therefore, of His preaching was not that of isolated oracular utterances, but of a comprehensive development of doctrine. The task of all other prophets was merely to announce, but Jesus was in a higher sense a divine instrument, in that He had in the fullest measure to bring about and complete the divine decree. Thus is explained the exertion of His miraculous powers, in which He bore witness to His own person, and at the same time to the nature of the divine kingdom as consisting essentially in a redemption, not only from sin, but also from the evil of sin; and, moreover, confirmed the complete certainty of the realization of that kingdom. Herein His own person appeared

generally as the central figure; and He consequently invited faith in Himself, and made all promises depend upon that faith.

The older prophets, such as Elias, and the rabbis of His own time, afforded Jesus a precedent for collecting a band of disciples round Him; and this was necessary to ensure the continued and everlasting operation of His personality after the close of His short public career. The calling of the disciples as a whole (cf. John i., Matt. iv., ix. 9, and parallel passages), and of individuals, was not completed at one time, but gradually (John i., cf. Matt. iv.). Having been stirred up by Him, they still continued to live in their own country, and were not always in His company until the time indicated in the synoptic account. Their number had symbolical reference to the twelve tribes. Luke (ch. xi.) mentions seventy other disciples, and this number, too, has a similar meaning. It might represent either (according to Jewish notions) the seventy peoples of the earth, and thus prefiguring the non-Jewish associates of God's kingdom (cf. John x. 16); or, which is still more likely, the seventy elders of Moses, and the number of the members of the Sanhedrim. The number and its symbolism is at any rate supported by that of the twelve, as well as by the internal probability of a larger circle of disciples, and their increased number immediately after the resurrection. All this corroborates Luke's account. What foresight Jesus showed in selecting His disciples we see from His rejection of an applicant (Matt. viii. 19 and ||). Peter He salutes at once as the Rock-man, Nathanael as the genuine Israelite, with a notice in the latter case (John i. 49) that He had previously observed him. His words in the naming of Peter, and call of the two brethren, to be fishers of men, were intended to fix the moment indelibly in their minds. His work in them thus began with the call itself. He chose them not merely to teach, but to educate them in the peculiar sense which the greatness of His person involved. They were certainly distinguished by instruction in many things which He either wholly withheld from the multitude, or imparted to them in a different manner. But the chief point was their constant familiar intercourse with Himself, and the lasting influence of His person in the contemplation of His life up to the final catastrophe of His death, followed by His resurrection and ascension, whereby, through the co-operation of His Spirit, they were themselves enlightened and perfected. They must not, however, be regarded merely

as individuals, but as members of a confederacy founded by Jesus ; and upon this confederacy the Church—the society of believers in Jesus—was founded. They had to testify of Him (John xv. 27), and to labour in His name (Mark iii. 14 ; Matt. xvi. 18, 19, xviii. 18 ; John xx. 21–23). He therefore sent them forth, even in His lifetime, to make trial of their strength (Mark vi. 30 ff., and ||), and often put them to the proof (John vi. ; Mark ix. 38, 39, cf. Luke ix. 49). With regard to Judas Iscariot, we cannot suppose that Jesus was deceived in him, or that he was a traitor at the time of his calling. In his fall, as Hase observes, we still recognise the ruins of apostolic greatness. His downfall shows a powerful nature ; and he had within him the groundwork of an apostle's character. But this groundwork must needs be developed to its perfection or ruin by his intercourse with Jesus. It was no more an act of cruelty in Christ to place him in this path, than it is in God when nations or individuals are placed in positions which lead to an unhappy moral issue. The confidence which became his ruin ought to have been his greatest moral preservative. That the natural disposition in Judas developed itself in opposition to Christ, is one of the mysteries of the divine free agency which it befits no man to call in question. Jesus was sensible of the disposition which Judas exhibited in his fall.

§ 15. *Jesus as a Teacher.*

The purport of Jesus' teaching will be seen as we go on. Its fundamental characteristic is the testimony which it bore to Himself, with which everything else is inwardly connected. If He speaks of God, He does so with the clear consciousness that no man knows the Father but the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal Him (Matt. xi. 27), and that no one has seen the Father but the Son (John vi. 46). In giving instruction, therefore, about the Father, He at the same time imparts knowledge about the Son,—that is to say, about Himself. So also, when He bears direct witness to Himself, He proceeds to speak of the Father, and again reverts to Himself, as if He wished, so to speak, to exhaust the subject. God is the Father, so far as He has, and sends into the world, the only begotten Son, that whosoever believes on Him may have life ; also Jesus specifies His own work, that He had come to seek and to save that which was lost. And this leads us to observe that He cannot treat even of the world

in His teaching, without also pointing out its relation, not only to God, but essentially to His own person, since it is only through Him that the world has and can have life. He alone has power over all flesh to confer life eternal. Mankind is, as it were, wedded to Him. He is the bridegroom who has the power to lead home His bride. He cannot, therefore, speak even of the earlier divine economy among men, without returning to Himself as the one in whom all else finds its aim and end. He is the heir of the vineyard planted of old by God among mankind. He came not to destroy the law and the prophets, but to fulfil,—to bring about their essential realization; in which, however, their original purpose is lost sight of in the higher potency now conferred upon them. Just as little can He speak of the perfection in store for the human race without distinct reference to His own person, since it is through Him alone that man's destiny can be fulfilled and consummated. He is the head and finisher of God's kingdom amongst men. Thus we observe that His teaching is throughout the unveiling and attestation of His own work and of His own person. The most connected and fullest of the discourses of Jesus are preserved to us in John's Gospel. Those recorded by the Synoptists are generally thought much simpler; indeed, the commentators of the last seventy years appear to have found little enough in them. But they present peculiar difficulty, in the fact that, by reason of their apparent clearness and simplicity, their more hidden depth and copiousness may easily be overlooked. Moreover, the discourses of Jesus are so broken up into detached portions, that it becomes more difficult to ascertain their general scope, many of them consisting of single sentences and isolated precepts, whilst those of greater extent are still no more than brief statements of doctrine on separate subjects. There are, indeed, discourses of a more connected character to be found in John, Matthew, and Luke, of which the sermon on the Mount (Matt. v.-vii.) and the farewell addresses (John xiii.-xvi.) are the most noteworthy examples. Besides these may be mentioned groups of parables (Matt. xiii.; Luke viii., xv., xvi., etc.), and the elements of more solid doctrinal teaching which belong to our Lord's last visit at Jerusalem; especially also the eschatological discourses as we have them in the Synoptists (Matt. xxiv., xxv.; Luke xvii. 20 ff.), together with the parables referring to the kingdom of God (Matt. xx.); lastly, other copious statements (*e.g.* Matt. xviii.)

which bear upon the relation of believers to each other in the Christian community. With all this, however, we do not meet with a complete whole in the gospels; and the characteristic peculiarity of the didactic matter in the Synoptists on one side, and in John on the other, increases the difficulty. Nor are the difficulties lessened, if, without endeavouring to bring the Lord's teaching into a kind of whole according to some self-devised scheme, we thoroughly examine the teaching itself, and investigate what the individual lines of thought may be, and how they may have been arranged in the consciousness of our Lord Himself. As regards the last point, we cannot of course represent that consciousness as it was in itself, but can represent His thoughts only so far as His own testimony extends, wherein He arranged them according to their comparative importance in connection with each other. The three fundamental ideas on which He rests are these: (1) the glorification of the Father in the Son; (2) the redemption of mankind through the Son; and (3) the establishment of the kingdom of God thereby. However various, therefore, the doctrinal statements of Jesus may appear, especially on a comparison of John with the Synoptists, their purport has constant reference to the above principles, and the germ of it may be traced even in the primary and summary announcement, "Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." The idea of the kingdom predominates in the Synoptists, but that of the self-revelation is not wanting (Matt. xi. 27); nor is the idea of redemption, which is treated of partly in parables and partly in simple testimony to His connection with the world of sinners (Matt. xx. 28, xxvi. 28, etc.). In John's Gospel, on the contrary, the first idea—that of glorification and the self-testimony of Jesus—takes a prominent position. In speaking, however, of His person, He could not but speak also of man's need of redemption; nor is the idea of the kingdom excluded (John iii.).

The more Jesus identified Himself with His teaching, the less susceptible would the people be to it, or, at all events, the more diversified would be their power of receiving it. Hence, in proportion to the distance between Himself and them, greater importance would attach to the form of His teaching as the medium of communication between His spirit and their capacity, by which form He bridged over the gulf between them. Hence the necessity of manifold forms, and such as did not at first allow His

immeasurable fulness to show itself, in which lay His perfect capacity for the task before Him. He was clearly conscious of His task of being a perfect teacher of God's kingdom, and of bringing out old things and new from His treasure (Matt. xiii. 52), and also of the entirely new import of His doctrine (Matt. ix. 16, 17; Mark ii. 21, 22; Luke v. 36-39).

In this consciousness He developes according to circumstances that plenitude of forms with which we see Him inexhaustibly supplied, and incessantly labours to bring home to His hearers the same truths in an endless variety of shapes, according to their several needs. His aim throughout was not merely to teach, in the narrow sense of the word, but to inform, awaken, enlighten, and emancipate soul and spirit, according to His own saying, that whosoever heareth and keepeth His words shall know the truth, and the truth shall make him free (John viii. 32). It is only by a religious appropriation of Him, which imparts spiritual life to men in general, that the object of His teaching is fulfilled. On that very account, however, He was obliged to select such a form of teaching as would lead not merely to a reception and recollection of His matter, but also to an internal appropriation and consideration of it in the mind and heart. And if this suitableness of teaching is called compromise, condescension to prevailing modes of thought, *accommodatio*, *συγκατάβασις*, *οἰκονομία*, we shall not oppose it; although we cannot, of course, admit such a compromise as would involve the sacrifice of conformity to His own consciousness and to objective truth, without wronging His character in an unhistorical way. The adaptation in Jesus' teaching is partly in the form, His statements being shaped according to the wants of His hearers, and partly, as regards its purport, in its negative character. This negative side is shown by not always directly attacking certain errors and prejudices in those who are addressed, but, instead of this, seeking gently to transform them (especially half truths, such as the Messianic ideas prevalent in His time), and raise up some positive notions in their stead. But His teaching is never positive in the sense of appropriating the erroneous ideas of His hearers, and thereby abandoning the truth. On the contrary, He acknowledged that His mission was to bear witness of the truth, and acted accordingly even with the whole world against Him.

In His public life He spoke and acted with the full conscious-

ness that He would incur the world's hatred and forfeit His life. The impression which His words produced upon the people quite accords with this earnestness; for they were thoroughly moved and struck by the power of His preaching, so unlike the studied and scholastic manner of the scribes (Matt. vii. 28, xiii. 54, 55, xxii. 33; John vii. 46, vi. 68 f.), and broke out sometimes into warm admiration.

The first of His modes of teaching was the apophthegm or gnome, in detached self-contained sentences, which present some point exciting peculiar interest, and thereby impress themselves firmly on the mind and memory. These gnomes appear sometimes singly, sometimes in connection with each other, forming a series, as in the Sermon on the Mount. At other times the sentence bears a subjective stamp, *i.e.* has reference either to the Speaker or hearers, and in the latter case assumes the form of an address. Even where the gnomic character is less constant, as, for example, in the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus always reverts to it, and utters some isolated truths in the gnomic form in order to give pungency and force to His discourse. The expression is sometimes of an actual, sometimes of a figurative character; indeed, the gnomic diction is fond of an admixture of figurative language. The figure was intended to bring home to the hearer an idea previously, either wholly or in part, closed to him. It does not exhaust the subject, but introduces to it, and enables the hearer to perceive it at least on one or more sides. He thus extracts from the analogy with the empirical subject as much of the ideal truth as he is at the time capable of receiving, intellectually and morally. The gnome or sentence, through the figure contained in it, grows into the parable.

The parable is the most perfect biblical form of figurative representation, and is frequently only a further developed figure, so that the boundary line cannot be distinctly drawn. The parable is based on an allegory; but this allegory is developed in the form of a narration. *Παραβολή* first signifies *comparison* (Luke v. 36, vi. 39; Matt. xv. 15; Luke iv. 23, xiv. 7; Mark iii. 23), and then the proper parabolic narrative (Matt. xiii. 3, 10, 18, 24, 31, 34, 36, 53, xxi. 33, xxii. 1; Luke xv. 3, xviii. 9, xx. 9). In John's Gospel the word does not occur, but only *παροιμία* (x. 6, xvi. 25), for allegorical as opposed to direct representation, which contains a comparison, but no narrative; as, for instance,

the good shepherd, the door of the sheepfold, and the true vine. (Compare the Old Testament כִּשְׁלֵי, Judg. ix. 7 ff.; 2 Sam. xii. 1 ff.; 2 Kings xiv. 9; Isa. v. 1 ff.; also Ezek. xvii. 1 ff., and especially ver. 2). Parables are distinguished from fables, not only by their religious and moral aim, and their loftier conception, but also by the fact of there being always a verisimilitude about the fictitious dress in which they are clothed: the circumstances are always such as supposably might happen, which is not invariably the case with fables. The parable, therefore, moves by preference in the world of men. Where the animal world is introduced at all, the comparison only expresses its relation to the rational being. The love of God towards morally lost and erring men is represented in the shepherd's conduct towards his lost sheep; but the sheep itself takes no active part in the development. The same thing is represented with greater force as the conduct of a human father towards his erring son, who, in this case, is himself converted. When, too, the parable rises to the spirit-world, the position of man (as Lazarus) is the chief subject. The aim of the parable is nearly the same as that of the simple figure. By means of the analogy between the sensible and the supersensuous, the nature of the latter is made discernible; and the parable works both by veiling and unveiling. It veils, in order that the full brightness of the idea may not dazzle and confuse the weak eyes of the beholder; in which case, unless he were roused to appropriate reflection, his unsusceptible nature might receive no benefit. On the other hand, the veil is so transparent, that even if the idea itself is not exposed to view, its light penetrates the eye (Matt. xiii. 13). For these reasons Jesus does not explain His parables before the people (Matt. xiii. 11-15), but only to the disciples, who being more susceptible might be able to grasp the truth (Luke viii. 10); but even in their case the parable was requisite in order to suggest the truth to them. It is the idea of God's kingdom which Jesus seeks especially to represent in parables, that being the one which had for ages flitted before His people's eyes under a vague and inadequate form, and to the spiritual apprehension of which it was needful now to raise and educate them. The parables of Jesus are sufficiently numerous to furnish a general, although an inadequate idea of His doctrine. Allied to the parable, but yet somewhat different in form, is the illustrative narrative, such as the story of the good Samaritan,

and that of the Pharisee and publican. Here both the vehicle of instruction and what is to be learned from it are homogeneous : the subject is exemplified in a concrete case, and the example thrown into an historical form. Narratives of this class are thus distinct from parables.

Another form of teaching, adopted by Jesus, is the historico-didactic, in which, without the employment of a material veil, the idea is based on some special matter of fact,—a situation in which one or more persons stand in the presence of Jesus, in a way quite consistent with His usual peripatetic mode of teaching. A general truth is set forth in its application to a concrete case. What it may thus lose in comprehensiveness it gains in perspicuity. Allowing itself to be separated from the concrete, the richest portion of its contents is first reached when the doctrinal idea on which it is based is brought to light; but a union with the concrete form was, and still is, the way of leading hearers unpractised in the concentration of general ideas into a train of thoughtful meditation. These narrations are, therefore, weighty and rich for practical use. Nor are they less serviceable in the scientific investigation of the doctrine of Jesus. We have numerous examples of interesting occasional discourses of this kind, in the shape either of answers to questions from the disciples, replies to His enemies, or exhortations which accompanied His miracles. When addressed, as in the case of the rich young man (Matt. xix. 16 ff.), He is not satisfied with giving merely the necessary reply to the question, but adds some instructive conversation; and even where the questioner had withdrawn, He does not let the occasion go by unimproved to His disciples (Matt. xix. 23 ff.; Luke xvii. 20, cf. 22–27). Frequently the discussion assumes a colloquial form.

Besides its different forms, we have to notice also the progressive development of His doctrine. Teaching as He did while journeying, as opportunity offered, or according to the wants and capacity, sometimes of the people and sometimes of individuals, He was compelled to shape His teaching according to this course of life. When He appeared in public, He found Himself standing in a peculiar relation to His nation, which relation offered both facilities and hindrances to His activity, both being caused by the whole preparation for His appearance lying in the Old Testament dispensation, and particularly in pro-

phcey. The whole of the Old Testament, with its laws and doctrines, might to a certain extent be presupposed; and He based His teaching entirely on the religious idea as we find it exhibited in the old covenant. But here great diversities arose in His mode of dealing with different individuals, according as their character had been formed by the Old Testament economy or not, and had shown itself susceptible or otherwise of its influence. There were, on the one hand, the mourners and poor in spirit, who were weary and heavy laden under the yoke of the law, and quietly waiting for the consolation of Israel. There were, on the other hand, the rich and wise of this world, who felt not their need of anything He had to offer. There were others, too, whose hearts, already hardened by self-righteousness, were not susceptible of His influence. We see, therefore, how many different modes of address He was obliged to employ. Great difficulties were, moreover, thrown in His way by the political conceptions of the Messiah which prevailed amongst the people; for He was thereby prevented from simply announcing Himself as the Messiah to those who were morally unsusceptible. They would have entirely misunderstood Him, and rendered His efficiency impossible; so that He was obliged, in dealing with them, rather to veil than unveil His Messianic character, and at the same time to make use of His position, in order to rouse them to a spiritual conception of the Messiah's kingdom, and then to come forward and bear witness to Himself as the appointed founder of that kingdom. Add to this the difference in cultivation and knowledge between the scribes and the lower orders, and we can readily understand in how many different ways He was obliged to propound His doctrine, and how nicely to regulate its progress. His consciousness of this is displayed in one of His latest discourses, in which He spoke of the many things He had to say to His disciples which He could then only express in figures (John xvi. 12, 25). His opening announcement was the same as that of John the Baptist. Then, according to the synoptic account, He unfolded what was requisite for participation in God's kingdom (Matt. v.-vii.). The discourses then pass on more definitely to the objective nature of the divine kingdom (Matt. xiii.), and then successively to the apostolic calling (Matt. x.), and to the general community of believers, with the introduction here and there of detached utterances on the relation of His person to the kingdom

(Matt. xi.), and especially to John the Baptist. But after this He adopted a more open and decided course, as the time of His sufferings drew near. When the reaction against Him set in, the declaration of His Messiahship became necessary, addressed to those who had been gradually prepared to receive it, in order to call forth a decided consciousness of this idea; at the same time He also announced His passion. All this was gradually done up to His entry into Jerusalem and the solemn disclosures of His last hours; and thus, what had so long been in preparation was brought to light and came to maturity in the hearts of His disciples. From John's Gospel, likewise, we may gather Jesus' conduct both in Galilee and Jerusalem. After the close of His first year's ministry, we read that He brought about the crisis by that "hard saying" (John vi. 60). Without expressly declaring Himself as the Messiah before the masses, by referring directly to His own person as the true spiritual food, He causes some to desert Him, and others to confess that He had the words of eternal life. He acted with similar reserve in Jerusalem (John ii.), matters of deeper import being reserved for individuals (John iii.). In the fifth chapter He more fully describes the nature of His work as one in co-operation with God, but still without directly asserting His Messiahship. In chaps. vii. to ix. we read of the same reserve; and in chap. x. He hints at His death. Here, too, the references to this become more explicit and decided as the end drew near. His farewell discourses contain the clearest and most public declarations, divulging as they do His essential community with believers and His promise of the Paraclete. All the accounts, therefore, agree as to this gradual progress.

From all this, it is evident that what He aimed at in His hearers was not a mere retentive grasp of the subject and external certainty, but an inner and heartfelt conviction. He is, therefore, continually building up something new on well-known foundations (Matt. xiii. 52), linking together the Old Testament and personal experience to the religious consciousness of His hearers. The rationalist assertion, that He builds upon the light of reason, may be admitted with the reservation, that in the only passage which speaks expressly of man's spiritual eye (Matt. vi. 22, 23), the possibility of its becoming darkened is presupposed. But, in addition to this allusive and derivative mode of teaching,

independent statements of doctrine are not wanting. He asserts the reality of truth, in appealing to the infallibility of His words and to His divine origin (John viii. 26, xii. 44 ff., iii. 11 ff.), as well as to the testimony of His mighty works, by which, without prejudice to His higher authority, men might be awakened to a living perception of His real nature (John v. 36, viii. 18, etc.). Belief, therefore, is only possible in the man who is willing to do God's will (John vii. 17, vi. 37, viii. 42 ff.; also Matt. xi. 25; Luke x. 21, 22). Hence the powerful impression which His teaching produced (Matt. vii. 28, 29, xiii. 54 ff., xxii. 33; John vii. 46, vi. 68, 69), an impression depending not so much on the matter and form of His discourses, as on the aggregate influences of the teacher's personality, to which they bore such powerful testimony.

§ 16. *The Actions of Jesus.*

The teaching of Jesus is the manifestation of His personality. This is both a moral act and the exhibition of that personality in the matter taught, both aim and form showing forth in Him the indissoluble unity of love and wisdom. His truth depends on His being one with the Father, and His love to men is shown by the presentation of this truth in the manner most suitable to their needs. Thus His teaching becomes a moral act of self-denial and dependence on the Father, no less than of love replete with wisdom. Likewise, also, His whole course of action appears to be the result of His unity with the Father; His spirit finds constant satisfaction in doing His Father's will (John iv. 34); and He thus lives for the world, and enters into it without belonging to it or relinquishing that unity. These main features constitute His character. It cannot be done justice to by a mere *catalogus virtutum*, still less by attempting to give characteristic importance to some particular quality. His character consists entirely in the harmony of His being, which is put to the test by His life, in which He ever remained without spot or blemish.

The full comprehension He displayed of the world, both of nature and of man, is the first testimony to this character. His appreciation of nature is shown by the liveliness of His imagery. In His sight all human splendour vanishes before the beauty which clothes the lily of the field; rain and sunshine are to Him the emblems of God's impartial beneficence. No creatures are too

insignificant for His notice ; and in them He recognises the Father's care, and they have His sympathy. In the approaching harvest He sees the image of a higher truth ; in the seed cast into the ground, the figure of God's quickening power. Nature, and the whole mystery of its organic life, is to Him the work and the reflection of God. Nature, therefore, does not draw Him away from the Father ; but a deeper insight into it tends always to His manifestation, and it is therefore a helper in His teaching of divine truth. While living in it, He ruled it. He was not overpowered by its delights, but they were spiritualized by Him. As with the life of nature, so of men. He enters fully into the latter, but especially in its relation to nature : the sower sowing his seed (Matt. xiii.) ; the gardener patiently waiting for fruit (Luke xiii.) ; the solicitude of the vinedresser (John xv.) in cleansing the plant with a view to greater fruitfulness. Grasping all these things in their living sense, He makes them types of divine truth. In like manner God's action towards men is reflected in their treatment of animals (Luke xv.). How tenderly, too, and with what discernment He takes in all purely human relations ! What a view of the child-world He opens to us, giving Himself up not merely to sentient delight in their presence, but recognising their relation to the kingdom of God ! No fuller conception of the parental and filial relation can be imagined than that portrayed in the parable of the prodigal son. Observe, too, how woman's life at its most critical moment is exalted by Him into a type of the highest kind (John xvi. 21). Numberless like traces of the view He took of the outer world show us how completely every side of human life, its sinful aspect alone excepted, found its counterpart in His own, in order that He might raise the world unto Himself.

In the same way, too, His actions show how He took a part in all the relations of life so far as His vocation allowed, and with what self-sacrifice He gave Himself up to them, yet without being injured and entangled by them, or contracting defilement from what was sinful in them. This we find especially in His family life and human friendships. Born of a woman, He belonged to a distinct family circle, His attachment to which is evinced by His long continuance in it ; and the bond of filial love remains unbroken all through His public life, even to His cross, in the agonies of which He fulfils the last duty of a loving

son. But still He is fully independent of His mother, putting her, as early as the marriage at Cana, in the subordinate position which was fitting for her, looking at His Messianic work. At Capernaum, likewise, He does not allow His teaching to be interrupted by the relations who would call Him away from it, but, against the human relationship, He asserts the still higher claims of the spiritual community. He had already shown the same independence in the occurrence which took place in His twelfth year. But He never on this account renounced His mother and His brethren, although it was with difficulty that they attained belief in Him (John vii. 5). How He was bound by the ties of friendship we see beautifully exemplified in His relation to the narrower and wider circle of His disciples, and also to the women who accompanied Him even to the cross; but yet no words of love in the human sense could ever divert Him from His vocation (Matt. xvi. 22, 23). The same unerring perception is observable throughout every side of His public life, whether in relation to the people, His hereditary religion, or the public authorities. He continued a true son of His nation, and never lost sight of its privileges and destiny, or forgot that salvation is of the Jews, and that He was sent unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel. He put forth all His powers to save His nation from the ruin which He saw advancing with rapid strides, and which called forth His lament over Jerusalem. But national prejudices had no power over Him, and in no way troubled the freedom of His spirit. He in no way shared the national hatred against Gentiles and Samaritans, but, on the contrary, rejoiced whenever He found faith amongst them, and remained unshaken in the consciousness that His work lay amongst mankind at large. Nevertheless, having been made subject to the law by circumcision, He remains true to it. He takes part in the national worship, is a diligent frequenter of the feasts, paying the temple tribute, although on higher grounds exempt from it (Matt. xvii. 24 ff.); and thus consistently carries out the principle laid down at His baptism by John (Matt. iii. 15). In the Sermon on the Mount, and on other occasions, the real meaning of the commandments of the law is contrasted with the Jewish interpretation. Likewise, with regard to sabbatical observance, He did not impair it, but remained perfectly true to the actual commandment of the Old Testament; but He expressed the real spirit of it in the axiom

that the Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath. Again, He took a still wider view of the whole of the divine economy, in the dictum that God can only be rightly worshipped in spirit and in truth. But, as the origin of such worship is from within, through the spirit in its fulness breaking through the narrowing barriers of form, it was possible for Him to abide by the old religious constitution of His nation without sacrificing either the freedom or the purity of the spirit within Him. On the contrary, He raised the law by His observance of it, as is shown by its subsequent effect. The relation in which He stood to the theocracy followed as a natural result. He was equally strict in His obedience as a subject to the heathen authorities, never allowing Himself to be carried away by the rebellious tendencies of His nation (Luke xiii. 1-3), but always regarding the refusal of obedience as a positive crime. No doubt He regarded the Roman dominion as a judgment upon His nation, but one from which nothing less than an inward renewal and conversion could set them free. His answer as to the tribute-money was twofold in its tendency, implying both that the Roman rule did not abolish the Jewish theocracy, and that both were united in His spiritual conception of the latter. His object was not to resist the secular authority, but rather to work under its protection. His dutiful behaviour as a subject is proved also in His examination before the tribunal. He did not resist His apprehension, merely declaring the injustice of treating Him as a murderer caught in the act, by arresting Him at night, and without any ascertained grounds of suspicion. He acknowledges Pilate's authority over Him, but at the same time maintains His own dignified position, by saying that the governor could have no power over Him unless it were given him from above; nor can Jesus be induced by any consideration to conceal the truth (John xviii. 28 ff.). In like manner He did not hesitate to unmask Herod's hypocrisy, who would have persuaded Him to avoid the Galilean territory, and to oppose to it His own decided self-consciousness on the subject of what was due to His higher calling (Luke xiii. 31 ff.). He appealed before the Sanhedrim to His public working as the best answer to His accusers; and neither the scourger who smote Him, nor the high priest who permitted it, could disturb His dignified equanimity. He displayed here exactly the same spirit as that in which He had

never allowed Himself to be intimidated or hindered in His work, although He gave no just ground for complaint, and in His wisdom knew how to avoid the snares laid for Him. Thus, in every position and relation, He is always consistent as one who lives in the world, but at the same time rules it.

The all-sidedness of His character, however, is seen especially in His private intercourse with individuals. Being, as He is, an example for all,—to the full-grown a picture of the highest maturity, to youth the image of true childish simplicity,—His heart is always open to all according to their needs. Think on His loving regard for the rich young man, and, in general, that tender sympathy for sinners, the union of wisdom and love, which made Him single out for notice those who by others, and by the Pharisees especially, were despised and shunned. But wherever He met with obduracy, hatred of the truth, and hypocrisy, notwithstanding His love and humility, He showed earnest severity in dealing with them. There was no sensuous softness in His love, for it was founded upon a true conception of mankind, which it was His task to realize. Thus everything in Him was rounded off into the fair proportions of a perfect character; humility and greatness, clemency and zeal, were mingled in the harmony resulting from the abnegation of self, and the ever wakeful consciousness of His unity with God. He is as sensitive as any other man to the natural feelings of hunger and bodily fatigue. His sense of honour is as keen and easily wounded, and His common sympathies are as quickly roused; but the divine consciousness always keeps pace with every external influence. Nevertheless, He rises superior to every bodily want (Matt. iv.), and is never hindered by this cause in His high calling (John iv.). He is, indeed, capable of being roused to anger (Mark iii. 5), not, however, in the shape of excited personal feeling, but of a holy and painful indignation at man's resistance to salvation. Hence arise stern reproofs, as in the case of the Pharisees and of the sin against the Holy Ghost, and sometimes acts of righteous severity, as the purification of the temple. We see also, under another aspect, how the consciousness of unity with God asserted its superiority over any outward affections on two circumstances of His passion: the agony of His soul in Gethsemane, intensified even to bodily results, and His *forsaken* feeling on the cross, which found expression in the words of a psalm. On both occa-

sions God still remains His Father or *His* God ; there is a change in the tone, but not in the direction of His will. Amidst the extreme horrors of His situation, when His human nature is overborne by bodily anguish and the scorn of men, the blessed feeling of being one with the Father is for a time, indeed, interrupted and superseded by the oppressive sense of need and desertion. But the bond, nevertheless, remains unbroken. He is still certain that the will of the Father, who appears to have forsaken Him, is good, and that He must fulfil it. This affords us most ample proof that His personality, although stirred to its very depths, was still perpetually under the guidance of His divine consciousness ; and thus we gain a complete delineation of that character in which wisdom and love are one.

§ 17. *The Miracles of Jesus.*

The gospels inform us that Jesus, during His public career, performed a number of miraculous deeds, partly influencing nature, but more especially mankind in their manifold sufferings, both bodily and psychico-bodily. The first of these miracles was, according to John (ii. 11), that at Cana in Galilee. They are all marked by the characteristic expressions τέρατα (מוֹפֵת, subjects for astonishment) (John iv. 48) and δυνάμεις (גְּבוּרוֹת, Matt. xiii. 58), which give, the one negatively, the other positively, a clear idea of the causality as supernatural. They are also called, with regard to their object, σημεῖα (אֵי, John ii. 23), because they bear in themselves the indications of a peculiar relation to the inner counsels of God's kingdom. The first and third of these expressions frequently occur together ; all three are found in Acts ii. 22. The Old Testament gives the idea of something new which God performs (Jer. xxxi. 31 ; Num. xvi. 30) ; and the New Testament has a similar idea of an occurrence, the cause and aim of which is to be sought, not in the general uniformity of nature, but in the higher power of God. With this agrees also the Jewish view, expressed with less distinctness by Nicodemus (John iii. 2), and again at the healing of the man born blind. Now there can be no doubt that the evangelists generally regarded these actions as miraculous. They accepted and related them as the working of a higher divine power inherent in Jesus. John relates only six of the most important ; but this does not prove either that he did not regard other occurrences as miraculous, or that he attached

less weight to miracles in general. On the contrary, his careful selection shows what significance he ascribed to them in the self-manifestation of Jesus. Nor can any aversion to the miraculous be justly imputed to Mark, either from the fact of his ascribing to Jesus an intermediate kind of agency in two of His miraculous cures (ix. 21, vii. 33), or because, in the case of the barren fig-tree, the curse did not instantaneously take effect (Mark xi. 20). Mark gives miracles enough which admit of no doubt whatever as to their real nature (vi. 56), their characteristic features being plainly discernible in the copiousness of his narrative; and his connection with Peter sufficiently explains his silence as to Peter's attempt when Jesus walked upon the sea. Such individual peculiarities merely prove the candour of the evangelists, who not only refrain from giving a miraculous colouring to anything, but conceal no feature which may appear to prejudice a miracle. All of them record those discourses of Jesus in which He appeals to His miracles. When Jesus forbids their publication, He has some special object in view, either to prevent any difficulty being thrown in the way of the healed person's lawful cleansing through the prejudice of the priests, or his being drawn away from the deeper meditation which would lead to belief; and such appears to have been the view taken by contemporaries. Even the enemies of Jesus did not deny the wonderful facts: they only raise the most absurd objections against their character (Matt. xii. 24), and in their malice try to avoid the conviction they are calculated to produce (Matt. xvi. 1-4; Mark viii. 11, 12). The facts themselves are admitted even in the words of mockery beneath the cross (Matt. xxvii. 42). The people, however, might look upon the miracles as signs of the Messiah, and render necessary the warning of Jesus not to rest in them to the neglect of what was more important. The historical fidelity of the gospel narratives is confirmed, moreover, not only by actual results, but by the miraculous power of Jesus continuing to operate during the lives of the apostles, as recorded by eye and ear witnesses beyond the sphere of the gospel history, as by the Apostle Paul (1 Cor. xii.).

The miracles of Jesus have been subject to a long probation of exegesis and criticism which seeks to set aside their miraculous character. The most unfortunate of these attempts was the purely exegetical, according to which no miracle was intended in

the text ; but even this has been of use in causing the rejection of much which was previously regarded on insufficient grounds as miraculous. In other cases, where the opposition assumed a more favourable aspect, the miraculous element in the narrative has received confirmation from the treatment it has undergone ; as, for example, the incidents of the stater in the fish's mouth, and of Jesus walking upon the sea. The natural explanation, and the procedure which would destroy the credibility of miracles by regarding them as myths, embrace a wider field ; but these attempts, like the others, only serve to put Jesus' miracles in a clearer light. The natural explanation finds no support at all in the accounts themselves ; for when it is said on one occasion that Jesus could not perform mighty works (Matt. xiii. 58), His inability is no more than unwillingness, occasioned by the unbelief of others (cf. Mark iii. 5), and merely proves that His miracles always had a positive aim. His cures being generally performed singly, whilst multitudes remained in His immediate neighbourhood uncured, does not in any way disprove the existence of an universal miraculous power, but only shows that the latter was not exerted except with definite and exalted ends, and under certain presupposed conditions. The accounts of His occasional use of external means, such as laying on of hands and the like, do not go beyond the employment of signs and symbols, a course abundantly justified where Jesus was dealing with a deaf and dumb man (Mark vii. 31), to whom He could not otherwise make Himself intelligible. The idea of any curative agency being attached to such means cannot be entertained ; but these symbols prove that Jesus wished also to work simultaneously upon the minds of men. Again, no inference can be drawn as to His employment of external means from the accusation that He profaned the Sabbath in His cures, because the same accusation would equally attach to the mere exorcism common amongst the Jews of His time (Matt. xii. 10 ; Luke xiii. 10, xiv. 2 ; John v. 16, ix. 6, cf. 16). The natural explanation, in its assumption of the mediation of physical causes, meets with no support at all in the history itself, which simply contradicts it. And it is equally unavailing for the disparagement of the miracles, by asserting that the death of those raised to life was only apparent, etc. ; for the existence of some hidden machinery in the background must always be assumed. This is, however, simply impossible in

miracles performed at a distance, as that of the healing of the nobleman's son, and also in the raising of the dead. Psychological influence also is excluded from miracles of this class, and equally so from those performed on natural objects, such as the loaves multiplied, the stilling of the storm, the changing of water into wine, and those cures in which the disease does not stand in any immediate relation to the spiritual life. Apart from this, the power of the will over the animal life does not, so far as is known, attain to such results.

The mythical has never been able to shake itself entirely free from the natural explanation; as, for instance, where it is disposed to allow the healing of demoniacs to pass for the mental superiority of Jesus over madmen, and to deny the fact altogether only where this evasion is not possible. The real ground of this view is a philosophical one, that miracles are *per se* inconceivable. This almost puts an end to criticism on individual miracles as to the character, magical or moral, to be assigned to them, as that the power of Jesus was exerted unconsciously (although, on the contrary, He was well aware of power going out from Him, and it most assuredly was not done involuntarily, as Jesus recognised the faith of the individual healed, although unacquainted with his person); or that His curse on the fig-tree was useless (which, however, receives sufficient warrant as a prophetic-symbolic act); or, again, that He caused the demons of Gadara to go into the herd of swine (when even the owners of the swine did not impute to Him that He had guided the demons, but only begged Him to withdraw in order to prevent the repetition of a similar occurrence). The Old Testament expectations and precedents fail to explain the origin of the histories of miraculous events as myths, as the fulfilment far surpasses these expectations. But, in the face of such expectations, how could the actual faith in the Messiahship of Jesus be explained, unless they found their fulfilment in the actual performance of the miracles? It is true, indeed, that apostolical letters written to existing communities, founded on the facts of the life of Jesus, and necessarily conversant with them, make no mention of these occurrences; also the missionary discourses (*e.g.* those in Acts ii. 22, x. 38, 39); but this is explained if we reflect that, at that time, the miraculous power of Jesus was still at work. The resurrection of Jesus, that greatest of miracles, is, however, sufficiently attested in these documents.

Everything seems to show that the miracles of Jesus can be accurately understood only in connection with His personality.

A miracle within the created world is, in a certain sense, always relative: creation alone is absolute. But, in this case, the creative power operates within the already existing world, and only produces in the latter something relatively new, founded on and in connection with it. Hence analogies to the miraculous are ever to be found in the course of nature; and so far there is truth in the philosophical hypothesis, which contends against the absolute miracle. It errs, however, first, in inquiring what can be effected in creation by given forces and laws, instead of asking what can be effected in the complex working of these by the accession of divine creative power; next, in regarding the knowledge of those laws as settled, which it is not. Jesus' miracles were not intended merely to meet the wants of men, nor did they result from His prophetic character, but from that of the Messiah, in whom man and God are united. They were an emanation from His personality, and were indeed natural to it. Miracles form a part of the self-revelation of His person, who, though He did not owe His life to the world, yet came into it and submitted to the conditions of its actual existence (John xiv. 10, 11, xv. 24). On this account they are the revelation to us of His power, no less than of His wisdom and love; and His unparalleled relation to God, as well as to the world, may be seen in them as clearly as in His teaching and other public acts. In working miracles, He fulfils the will of God (John x. 32, v. 26, xi. 41, 42, x. 37); and they are done in the power of God (Matt. xii. 28; Luke xi. 20; John v. 26). But this power and will of God are exactly identical with His own (John xiv. 6, xi. 25). Miracles are *σημεῖα* of His person, and therein of the divine kingdom about to be established. Jesus demands to be believed for His very works' sake, but equally requires that the belief should not stop there (cf. § 32); and for this reason He refuses to perform any miracle merely for the display of His power (Matt. xii. 38). And in His miracles, no less than in His teaching, He presupposes susceptibility and faith. On the other hand, as the person of Jesus appeared in this existing world, His miracles also are not wholly unconnected with nature, and are built upon existing objects. Natural analogies are not to be absolutely rejected, as He Himself pointed out in the outward acts which accompanied His miracles. But they have

also in relation to Himself a purely human side, as manifestations of the love which is at one with wisdom ; they are *καλὰ ἔργα* (John x. 32 f.), in which His moral character is revealed. In them, too, we see His perfect entry into the whole domain of human life and suffering, particularly as He always connects suffering with sin and the consciousness of guilt (Matt. ix. 1-8). His love is shown therein as embracing the perfecting cure of all human suffering. But the object common to all miracles, which is also the highest aim of all His love and wisdom, is never lost sight of, viz. to lead on to faith in Himself, and (Matt. xii. 28) to pave the way for the establishment of the divine kingdom, whose completion is looked forward to as the perfect deliverance from sin and its consequences.

IV. THE CONCLUSION OF HIS LIFE.

§ 18. *The Sufferings and Death of Jesus.*

The fact of Jesus resigning Himself to death proves that the end of His public activity was attained, the gradual development of which is set before us in the gospel history. But it had now reached the point at which no further results of importance were attainable without the aid of the final catastrophe of His earthly life. The impression He had already made was so great that it could now propagate itself. His form was so indelibly stamped on hearts susceptible of its impress, that the possession of it was for ever secured to mankind : He could not expect to win over the people in a body, even by a longer period of activity. But the impression made on the susceptible might be enhanced ; and even upon the mass of the nation and the less impressible, yet one more great sensation might be attempted, by means of the impending catastrophe and the acts which preceded it and determined its character. The progress even of the disciples themselves was limited by the progress of His career. A boundary seemed to be drawn, beyond which their comprehension could not pass, so long as His bodily presence gave any support to their material hopes. What could be effected from without had been done ; but their higher inspiration could only be attained after, and by means of, the change which His death wrought in His person.

Distinct predictions of His passion are not the only instances of Jesus' prescience (cf. John xiii. 19, xvi. 1 ff.), and can only be objected to on a philosophical hypothesis which refuses to recognise the unity of His spirit with God. Moreover, the application of features derived from the Old Testament cannot cause us any scruple, so long as we allow that no sound exegesis of the principal passage (Isa. liii.) could regard the servant of God apart from the Messianic idea. But how He expressly foretold His death, and how this death was specially sealed by the institution of the Lord's Supper, and how strongly He dwelt throughout upon the necessity of His passion, belongs more particularly to the statement of His teaching.

Although Jesus submitted to death of His own free will (John x. 18), it was nevertheless brought about by the historical development of His life, and by the hostile disposition towards Him which was excited by the testimony He bore to Himself as the Messiah. Cautious, guarded, and gradual as the statement of His claims at first was, He could not fail ere long to incur the bitter hostility of the leading men, seeing that He neither fulfilled their expectations nor promoted their interests. If He succeeded, their rule was at an end. They consequently forbade the people, under pain of the curse, to acknowledge Him as the Messiah; and the growth of their hatred kept pace with the development of His doctrine (John vii. 7, 10). They soon attempted to seize and put Him to death, and He reproached them with their murderous intention; but no one for a time ventured (vii. 30), or was able to lay hands on Him (x. 39). He left them and avoided the snares, which had, however, so impressed His disciples that they were surprised when He again desired to go to Jerusalem. He goes to Bethany, and the raising of Lazarus follows. This determines the resolution of the Sanhedrim; for they now feared a popular demonstration in His favour, followed by a rebellion, which would involve the people and themselves in one common ruin. Thus political fear is added to personal dislike and party feeling. Yet Jesus withdraws only for a moment, and then makes His public entry into Jerusalem. The public rejoicing rouses the suspicion of His enemies, Jerusalem being filled with strangers at the festival, who were not under their control. They determined, therefore, to seize His person, but to proceed against Him with secrecy,—a resolution which was changed

by the offer of Judas, who entered into negotiations with them. The statement (John xiii. 2) that Satan entered into Judas after the Last Supper is not inconsistent with the fact that he had already closed with them; for, immediately before the deed, a resolution still remained to be taken which would make the whole irrevocable. Jesus' conduct sufficiently proved that He had no intention of employing the people against the rulers, since, after His triumphal entry, He continued to work merely in His usual manner. At the same time, they were provoked at the greater power and freedom of the invectives which He launched against them during that week; and His discourse on the last evening hastened the accomplishment of Judas' purpose. The symbolical signification of the Passover made death welcome to Jesus at that season (the Talmud itself recognises the expectation of the redemption of Israel taking place during that feast). But it was of the utmost consequence to Him not to be slain secretly, since it was only by a public death that full effect could be given to His resurrection. On the other hand, the members of the Sanhedrim thought that His public execution, especially if brought about by the heathen authorities, would put an end once for all to the belief in His Messiahship.

The question now remains, how far Jesus was morally justified in thus going to meet His death. It is true, indeed, that He only allowed His enemies to carry out their resolves, but then He took no pains to avoid, and even challenged the issue. The moral necessity of His death may not be too lightly asserted without acknowledging the conditions which it necessarily involves. If Jesus was no more than a prophet and teacher of the truth, His death would certainly possess great moral significance as a confirmation and example; but He would not in that case have been justified in seeking it. He might have avoided it, and would have been bound to do so; for thus His work might have been prolonged in Galilee, if not in Jerusalem. The heathen world, moreover, lay open to Him, and such a spirit as His could have found a sphere of action anywhere. The question assumes a different aspect, supposing His death to have been a divine necessity imposed by the peculiar nature of His vocation. Our view must not, however, be limited to any single divine revelation to Him on this point; for His destination as the Messiah throws light on the whole subject. In this His action was limited to His own people,

and directed to its central point ; and He had to present Himself to the nation as their Messiah, and uphold His claims at whatever cost, unless He were willing to abandon the destiny marked out for Him in the divine counsels. And here comes in the hypothesis of His real Messianic personality wherein He was one with God. In this way only can we understand how death was included in the original plan of His life, and particularly why His death was brought about at the exact time and in the exact way in which it was, through a forcible declaration of His person, and of His intention to establish a kingdom in His own sense of the word. The value of Jesus' death is not diminished by the fact of the resurrection also being in His consciousness bound up with it. The death does not become less real on that account ; for Jesus does not resume His former mortal condition, but death still continues to be the suspension of bodily life, and the passing of the soul into a supernatural state. Gethsemane proves that Jesus did not gain the conviction of the moral justification and divine necessity of His death without a struggle. He sought the well-known spot in order to give Himself up entirely to intercourse with the Father. Here He became fully sensible of the decisiveness of the step He was about to take. This is, however, no isolated instance of this frame of mind. He had already, Luke xii. 50, expressed His apprehension of the impending catastrophe, and again, John xii. 27, 28, a few days before His death. These earlier examples bear witness to the reality of the feeling which reached its climax in Gethsemane. That was the precise moment when this frame of mind could not but declare itself in the strongest manner. The strength of His anticipation, at the moment when His sufferings approached, proves only His complete consciousness of the step He was taking. He had, perhaps, ere this turned His glance at the whole of His work, and ideally looked on it as completed. When uttering His high-priestly prayer, He had already felt Himself to be the great High Priest and Mediator between God and man. But now the decisive step for the completion of that work is closely impending. Here He stands in Gethsemane as the sacrifice about to devote itself to the altar. Uniting in His person the two offices of victim and priest, He must needs combine both ideas in the alternating frame of His own mind. Now it was in Gethsemane that He mentally performed the sacrifice. Here, therefore, He pictured to Himself

all that was before Him; His thoughts do not cling to the present moment, but embrace the whole task that He had taken upon Himself. Having gained the mastery in the struggle of this moment, He became tranquil, and maintained His self-possession under the most trying circumstances. This is shown in His sublimity and dignity when face to face with every injustice, in the gentleness which distinguished degrees of offence, in the resignation which acknowledged all as the dispensation of God, and, above all, in the love which, under the heaviest load of personal suffering, still showed itself susceptible of that of others, and made it the object of special consideration. *In fine*, this struggle evinces His full consciousness of the step He was about to take; but as everything was concentrated in this one moment, the feeling thus produced well-nigh subdued Him, and filled His soul with a horror which He could only master by prayer. For in all great suffering the moment immediately preceding its commencement is always the most torturing to the human mind; when in the midst of the anguish, the soul is in a manner elevated. Such anguish He experienced, yet without ever harbouring a doubt of God, or losing sight of Him as the proper object of His consciousness. It is not only death, however, which He goes forth to meet, the fear of which He overcomes; He also has to experience the power of sin concentrated against Him. The deeply felt injustice of His death is present to His soul, and the curse which the guilt of it will bring upon His people; indeed, in the very midst of His agonies, He is more acutely sensible of the baneful power of sin over mankind (Matt. xxvi. 41; Luke xxiii. 34) than of His own suffering. But to Him, the sinless One, the death itself which He was about to encounter is something unnatural, and hence His anguish at having to undergo the extreme penalty of sin.

It belongs to the province of biography to describe the rapid succession of events inwardly prepared for and decided on by Him, but which was precipitated by His enemies in their haste to secure the result without interrupting the feast. As to the fact that Jesus really died, historical testimony is unanimous. Had He not died, His whole life and teaching would have been deprived of its final truth. His teaching shows how He Himself looked upon His death as the manifestation of His person and of His work, in the perfection of self-sacrifice and the complete

adoption of humanity through His fully sharing in the sense of sin by His personal experience of its worst evil.

§ 19. *Resurrection and Ascension of Jesus.*

The accounts of the several appearances of the risen Jesus are not at variance with each other, for they are only fragments which evidently stand alone, and were selected with a plan and a purpose. Matthew, for instance, thought it sufficient to relate the first appearance immediately consequent on the fact, and the last in Galilee which was also of essential importance. Nor does the change of scene present any difficulty. The disciples might very well stay at Jerusalem until the conclusion of the feast, although Jesus had bidden them go into Galilee; and after their sojourn there, they could easily have returned to Jerusalem on the approach of the season of Pentecost, and receive His command to await there the outpouring of the Spirit. The narrative of the first appearance is, however, common to all four evangelists. Now it is not possible to assume either an apparent death and a successful awaking from it brought about by divine providence, or so extravagant a plan as that Jesus allowed Himself to be crucified in order to give colour to an assumed resurrection. Moreover, the supposition of a deception, wrought by the apostles, is an unworthy one, and that they could have been self-deceived is impossible; so that there remains only the possibility of a mythical explanation for those who are entirely determined to evade the historical one. But how could the myth arise? According to the gospels, the disciples had, before the fact, no belief which could give rise to such a hope, but were, on the contrary, in a dejected frame of mind in consequence of the death of Jesus; and this is exactly what the history would have led us to expect. The great revolution in their frame of mind can only be accounted for by the supposition of some extraordinary occurrence. And a vision can in no way suffice for this. The Apostle Paul, in enumerating amongst other appearances in proof of the resurrection, the one which he had himself experienced, in no way sanctions the supposition that he regarded them all as visionary, but only shows that he looked upon his own also as objective. The purport and aim of his statement presuppose the characteristics of objective appearances; for five hundred men do not at the same moment experience a merely subjective one. Unless, therefore, special aversion to

miracles is raised into the highest law of investigation, it is impossible to avoid presupposing just such an extraordinary fact as is presented in the gospel history of the resurrection.

The appearances of the risen One are recorded in such a way as to show that they are neither to be regarded as visionary nor as the appearances of one again returning to a permanent continuance of an earthly life. His soul had really left His body, according to the New Testament doctrine (1 Pet. iii. 18, 19), and the resurrection restored the bond of union between them; but the question remains, whether the result was a re-establishment of mere bodily life under its former conditions, or, on the contrary, that a glorification took place to a new and immortal life. The phenomena recorded in John xx. 20-27, Luke xxiv. 39-43, Acts x. 41 (John xxi.) have indeed been appealed to in support of the former supposition; but what they go to prove is no more than the fact of real bodily appearance as opposed to an incorporeal or visionary apparition, without excluding a glorified corporeality. The latter supposition, on the other hand, seems to gain confirmation from other features, such as the descriptions of His coming and going (John xx. 26, xxi. 1, *φανερωθῆναι*), and the designation of His going as a "vanishing" (Luke xxiv. 31). With this also agree the pains He took to convince the disciples of the reality of His body, and also the expression *σημεῖον* for His resurrection (John xx. 30). And even if the real state of the case cannot be exactly made out, the evangelists, at all events, represent the resurrection as a renewal of life, from which the idea of a second death was excluded. This view assumes a more definite form in the apostolic teaching, according to which the resurrection of Jesus runs completely parallel with our own,—the latter being, however, a glorification (1 Cor. xv. ; Rom. viii. ; Col. i. ; 2 Cor. iv. ; Rev. i.). For this reason the ascension is associated with the resurrection, and, indeed, indirectly with the crucifixion itself (1 Pet. i. 21 ; Eph. i. 20, ii. 6 ; Rom. viii. 34 ; Acts ii. 32, 33, v. 31 ; [Rom. i. 4, xiv. 9 ; Phil. ii. 9]). And although the two events are so distinguished that the appearance of Jesus cannot be described as a mere descent again from heaven to earth, yet a combined view of all the circumstances seems to favour the opinion that a gradual glorification began at the resurrection, but was not completed until the ascension. It is in the nature of the case that we should not be able to picture to ourselves any exact

view of this process. His previous intimations testify that the resurrection of Jesus formed an essential part of His work. He Himself makes early allusion to it in speaking of the rebuilding of the temple (John ii. 19–22); and although in the temple, which was to be destroyed through the obstinacy of the Jews, there may be some reference to the destruction of the material building, still the words mainly refer to the new temple of His risen body. The discourse about the sign of the prophet Jonah belongs to the same subject. But, besides these allegorical allusions, we have also distinct announcements in connection with the notification of His suffering (Matt. xvi., xvii. ||). There is also the discourse before His apprehension (Matt. xxvi. 32); and on another occasion the time is incidentally mentioned (Matt. xvii. 9). Compare also what is related by John (x. 17, 18), with which agrees the discourse about the quickening power of the flesh and blood of Jesus (John vi.). The farewell discourses also (John xiv.–xvi.) do not merely refer to a spiritual coming again, but as clearly (*e.g.* John xvi. 22) to an outward and visible reappearance. It cannot be said that, these intimations being presupposed, the unbelief of the disciples is unintelligible; for the matter was still beyond their comprehension. Nor is the ethical character of His death impaired by it: it is still a real death, as certainly as that of Christians who believe in His and their resurrection. The use He made of His predicted reappearance was not to renew His connection with the multitude, which would have disturbed the quiet course of His work, but with believers, for the purpose of giving them new and final charges and promises, and especially to explain to them His sufferings, so as at once to transfer them to a higher standpoint. Thus the closer significance of the fact itself was, on the one hand, to set His death in its true light, and to justify Him in it, and, on the other, to prove His life to be superior to death, which life He in His power is able to impart to others.

The credibility of the ascension depends upon the foregoing fact of the resurrection. Existing conceptions of the Messiah afforded no groundwork for the construction of a myth on this subject. The Jews pictured to themselves a Messiah who would remain on earth. The ascension is in full harmony with the Christian idea, and consistently closes the life of the risen Saviour; but these are the grounds for a fact, and not for a myth, so soon as the reality of the resurrection is admitted. Such an occurrence,

indeed, must have induced the disciples to wait in full assurance of faith for the outpouring of the Spirit, and no longer to hope for the immediate return of Jesus. The conscientious narrative of Luke is sufficient authority for this event. But although the objective fact is not mentioned in apostolical literature, yet the dogmatically important result of the fact, the "sitting at the right hand of God," is frequently spoken of throughout the New Testament; sometimes, indeed, in expressions (such as Acts ii. 32, Eph. iv. 8-10, 1 Tim. iii. 16) which point to the event itself. Although the evangelists Matthew and John do not expressly mention it, they have handed down to us discourses in which the higher fact is attested (John vi. 62, xx. 17, the farewell discourses, and Matt. xxviii. 16-20). It is this higher fact, the entrance into the invisible world without death, that naturally completes the glorification begun at the resurrection. The external and symbolical occurrence, the elevation and concealment of Jesus within the cloud, was only intended to signify to the disciples that their position was now definitely settled, and that henceforth they were to regard their Master as belonging to the invisible world. Death was vanquished at the resurrection; in the ascension, the incomplete perfection of the corporeal element is subordinated. If Jesus overcame death in the biblical sense, His victory must necessarily be followed by this transformation into a glorified state. And hence the ascension is not only the assurance and foreshadowing to us of our heavenly life (Col. iii. 1-4; cf. 1 John iii. 2; Acts iii. 26), but also the fact on which depends our belief in the future change of our mortal life, which, according to the apostle's teaching, is in store for us.

SECOND DIVISION.

THE TEACHING OF JESUS.

§ 20. *Summary.*

THE teaching of Jesus is presented to us as the declaration of the salvation involved in His appearance, and more in detail—

- (1) Of the glorification of the Father in the Son.
- (2) Of the redemption of mankind through the Son.
- (3) Of the kingdom of God in which both the glorification and the redemption find their accomplishment.

Amidst all the varieties of form and manner, a unity of purpose is plainly evident in our Lord's teaching, which makes it possible to draw up a regular statement wherein the various doctrinal elements may be traced back to the fundamental idea which forms the internal unity of the teaching, and from which their organic completeness is derived. But this course has not uniformly been adopted; for, in presenting our Lord's teaching from the historical and exegetical point of view, men have allowed themselves, especially in biblical theology, to bring both biblical teaching in general, and this branch of it in particular, into conformity with certain current dogmatical formulæ.

The characteristic title *εὐαγγέλιον*, the message of salvation, by which He Himself distinguished His teaching, enables us to discern without difficulty the thread of unity which runs through it. He applies this name in its absolute sense to His teaching (Mark i. 14, xiii. 10; Matt. xxvi. 13); it is this which He proclaims and which is announced by the apostles in His name (Mark xvi. 15; Matt. xxvi. 13). It is to a salvation now within view that His message refers (Mark i. 15). The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand. It is therefore the gospel of the kingdom of God, and is so called by the evangelists themselves (Mark i. 14; Matthew *passim*). The subjects of the Lord's teaching are accordingly named by Him the mysteries of the kingdom;

doctrines previously hidden from mankind, but at length by divine revelation made known to them (Matt. xiii. 11; Luke viii. 10). Accordingly, it is not only, in general terms, salvation which had been brought to light, but, in particular, God's kingdom as destined to be established and forthwith perfected through the revealed Messiah, that is pointed out as the subject of the Lord's teaching (Luke iv. 43). Here, too, He declares that it belongs to His office and ministry to preach the gospel of the kingdom in the other cities also, for that to that purpose He was sent. In exact agreement with this, the Lord includes in the task assigned to Him the work of making known the name of the Father, revealing and declaring Him (John xvii. 4, 6, cf. i. 17, 18). Agreeably with this, it appears also from what He says, Matt. xi. 27, that the essential relation subsisting between the Father and the Son necessitates that the knowledge of the Father should be imparted only through the Son. Hence, to reveal and declare Him formed a part of the task committed to Him by the Father. This, therefore, is one side of the gospel of the kingdom of God—to reveal the nature and name of the Father, to make Him known and to glorify Him through the Son amongst men first. The other side of it, namely, Jesus' relation to mankind, is indicated in other expressions. The Lord specifies His task as that of saving and blessing, that is, in short, redeeming the lost, and rescuing mankind from the corruption of sin (Matt. xviii. 11, xx. 28; Luke xix. 10). This is the *σωθῆναι* for men through the Son of God (John iii. 16, 17), or the salvation, the *σωτηρία*, for all mankind, which, so far as the *σωτήρ τοῦ κόσμου* appears in it (John iv. 42), was to proceed from the Jewish nation (John iv. 22). In this *σωθῆναι* of mankind lies the life (*ζωή*) of which those who have fallen into the ruin of sin are made partakers through Christ. Thus the Lord Himself characterizes the scope and purpose of His own teaching. We have also the plainest references to the purport of His teaching and the aim of His work, of which, indeed, His teaching forms an essential portion; this work, too, being of necessity the chief subject of His teaching. By His own expressions, His teaching is pointed out to us as the gospel, and we are led on to the two aspects of it, His relation to the Father and to man, through which the whole relationship between God and man has received its peculiar form. We are thus clearly shown our Lord's express percep-

tion of unity in His own teaching. He is assured of, and defines the nature of, His teaching as being gospel, as in truth a message that the kingdom of God has now appeared as an accomplished fact, in which He knows is involved both the glorification of the Father and the redemption of mankind through Himself. Being, then, in the first place, assured of the unity of our Lord's teaching by its gospel character, we have the divisions of its organization in the above-named points. We have purposely so arranged these divisions that the kingdom of God is taken last, and regarded as the result of the other two acts, the glorification of the Father, and the redemption of the world. The conception of the kingdom of God is obviously the more complex and pregnant, and includes the conceptions both of God and man, definitely presupposing the relation of each to the other. This third point might indeed have been put first, but then there would have been no gradation, and we should have had to anticipate. In one respect, certainly, it would have been desirable to give this priority to the doctrine of the kingdom of God, because we could then have begun with the teaching connected with it, to which our Lord Himself gave priority in the preparative attitude which He first assumed. But it is easy to see that this was a *συγκατάβασις* on His part. It was the wisdom of His teaching which adopted this course, out of regard for the subjective need of His hearers; but also, in these very discourses which He delivered in the earliest days of His ministry, the subject of the kingdom of God was not exhausted, other points being reserved for His later discourses upon the course of its development.

We therefore believe that we shall best penetrate into the inner essence of the teaching of Jesus, if, amongst its three main points, we give the last place to that of the kingdom of God, as the one in which both the others converge. But we see at once the organic connection which subsists between them: each leads to the others; and neither, without the others, can be perfectly developed. The glorification of the Father in the Son and in the Spirit leads of itself to the subject of redemption with which the former is inseparably connected, so soon as we consider it in its relation to mankind; and hence the second supplements the first, and both together find their issue in the kingdom of God, in the first place amongst men.

It must, however, be observed that we are not concerned with

isolated and abstract ideas either of God or man. As regards the former, we exclude even the universal conception of God, but are concerned with Him as Father in the precise Christian definition of the term. And viewing Him as glorified in the Son, we are brought into direct contact with a living act, and God is comprehended in the living activity of His manifestation and glory, into the circle of which man also, notwithstanding his sin, is admitted, and his redemption thereby accomplished. In the same way man must be regarded, not *per se*, but in immediate relation to God, and therefore in the quality in which he must be considered in a religious point of view; in the ethico-religious side of his character corresponding to his relation to God, not, therefore, merely as a sinner, but as the object of the divine act of redemption, and standing consequently in a determinate relation not only to the Father, but also to the Son as Mediator between God and man. With a like disregard for any abstract notion of the world, we look upon it from an ethico-religious point of view in its relation to God, and as the destined seat of His kingdom. And herein it must be considered not only in its relation to God in general, but essentially to the only-begotten Son of God, who, as the Mediator between God and the world, is called by the Apostle Paul the first-born of all creatures.

Our treatment of the teaching of Jesus will therefore differ materially from that of others whose method is founded upon the more or less usual canons of dogmatism. And we may indulge the hope that, after having first clearly enunciated the fundamental principles of Christ's teaching common to the synoptical and St. John's accounts, it may be possible to arrive sooner at an order of arrangement corresponding to the intention and character of that teaching.

I. THE GLORIFICATION OF THE FATHER IN THE SON.

§ 21. *God the Father.*

The teaching as to the Father, with which we begin, is set forth in our Lord's discourses only so far as it stands in essential relation to that of the Son, or of the children of God, and is therefore

opposed *in limine* to an abstract idea of God. There are, indeed, certain of His discourses in which no direct reference is made to the Son, as (in the first three evangelists) in the Sermon on the Mount, and (in John) the conversation with the Samaritan woman (iv. 21, 24). But even in these such a reference is made indirectly; for in the Sermon on the Mount, in referring to the kingdom of God, Jesus represents Himself as its Founder and Lord (cf. Matt. v. 17 ff., and vii. 21 ff.); and, in conversing with the woman, He refers to the salvation which was to come by the Messiah, and points out that the time for praying to God in the Spirit had arrived (cf. vers. 10, 14, 26), because salvation had already appeared in Him. Other discourses, however, make it plain how essentially that reference is contained in His teaching; and we are therefore fully justified in understanding what He taught of God as relating to the Father. Our Lord Himself so understood and regarded it, as, for instance, in the important discourse of Matt. xi. 25-27.

No further proof is needed that our Lord's discourses do not contain any complete development of the doctrine of God's being and attributes. This is explained by the fact that His teaching was not systematic, but that He selected sometimes one topic of discourse, sometimes another, and adapted it to His hearers' wants, presupposing always the religious faith of the Old Testament, but elevating even this to a higher stage by the revelations of His teaching. In the Old Testament faith is implied the belief in the living, intelligent, and holy God, the Creator and Lord of the world, on whom it absolutely depends,—a belief opposed not only to polytheism, but also to dualism (cf. in the latter respect, Isa. xlv. 5-7); the belief, too, in a moral relation of man to God, and especially in a divine plan of salvation, which, embracing the whole human race, finds its first realization in the people of Israel (cf. Gen. xii. 3, xxviii. 14; Isa. xlii. 1, 4, 6, xlix. 6, lx. 3; Mic. iv. 2). Without attempting here to discuss further the substance of the Old Testament faith, it will suffice to direct attention to a few important particulars in which our age not unfrequently goes too far in stating and passing judgment upon the religious belief of the Old Testament. Thus, with regard to the so-called moral attributes of God in the conception of Him founded on the Old Testament, the characteristics of a jealous and just God are brought forward too prominently, although in the Old Testament that of mercy is as

essentially and prominently asserted, nay, even more so than the others (cf. as principal passages, Ex. xxxiv. 6, 7; Ps. lxxxvi. 5, 15, ciii. 8-18, cxlv. 7-10; Joel ii. 13; Jonah iv. 2, 10, 11). In addition to this, the relation of God to man in the Old Testament is wont to be represented as if in the old belief He were conceived as standing opposed to, and at an infinite distance from, mankind. This is, at least, a great exaggeration; for, although the opinion opposed to this is a speciality of Christianity, standing out conspicuously in the doctrine of the incarnation, and of the Spirit indwelling in believers; yet not only is the doctrine of God's omnipresence put forward with sufficient liveliness and force, so that the world appears entirely dependent on the presence of God, but also as regards the spiritual nature and inner life of man, the Old Testament undoubtedly recognises the Spirit of God working in him. The Old Testament also clearly recognised that the Spirit of God should first rest in full measure on the Messiah (Isa. xi. 2), and be then revealed and poured out in His seven-fold activity upon all flesh, upon all mankind (cf. Joel iii. 1, 2, and later Isa. xlv. 3; Ezek. xxxvi. 26, 27, cf. xi. 19, xxxix. 29, also Isa. liv. 13; Jer. xxxi. 33; [John vi. 45]). According to this, the truth that God is not merely and absolutely external to man is decidedly recognised in the Old Testament, which, however, holds most firmly to the distinction of God from the world, as of the Creator from the creature, the Holy One from sinners, and is well aware of the fact that the revelation and self-communication of God to men is not yet complete, but that another phase of the intercourse between them is still impending. It also clearly understands that in the belief in a God who has not left Himself without witness amongst men is contained also the belief of a moral relation between God and man, at first gradually developed, approaching completion in the Messianic times, and to be consummated hereafter. From what has been said, it will be easy to understand how much is implied in the statement that our Lord presupposed the Old Testament belief, and what a deep foundation was already laid for a living system of divine teaching; also that in a certain measure only one essential step was wanting to at once transform the faith in God of the Old Testament into that of the New, and thereby to fulfil Moses and the prophets. This result was brought about in our Lord's teaching apparently by the most simple means, but in a

manner most richly productive of fruit, and bearing in itself the germ of infinite development. The aim of His teaching as to the nature of God being to quicken men's belief in Him as a living and personal God, and consequently as standing in a moral relation to the world and to man, the two points to which He gives greatest prominence, and by means of which He completes the Old Testament conception of the divine being, are, that *God is a Spirit*, and that *God is the Father*. These two definitions are not expressed in this way in the old covenant, but, coming from our Lord's lips, they elevate the Old Testament conception of the divine being to its New Testament potency: they stand in an inner connection with each other, and from them proceeds all that is contained in the testimony of Jesus concerning the divine attributes.

We begin with the definition that *God is a Spirit*, because the second and fuller one, that God is the Father, to a certain extent presupposes the other. This conception is pronounced in a discourse preserved by St. John, and is addressed to the Samaritan woman and not to the Old Testament believers, just as if the latter, already entertaining this view to some extent, had less need of the idea as a new definition of doctrine. The spiritual nature of God had been more and more revealed under the Old Testament dispensation, and now the idea needed only to be brought out in a definite shape. The definitions of the Old Testament conception of God most nearly connected with this part of the subject are the following: (a) First, the conception of God as יהוה, the One who exists, who is and will be, as the God who appeared to Moses, explained this name (Ex. iii. 13-16, cf. Isa. xlv. 6; Rev. i. 4). Hence it signifies the *simply existent One*, co-extensive with Himself, and eternal; and the name clearly contains the root of *to be*. (b) Next comes the definition of God as the *living God* (Deut. v. 23; Isa. xxxvii. 4, 17; Jer. xxiii. 36), which also occurs in the New Testament (Matt. xvi. 16), and in the mouth of our Lord Himself (ὁ ζῶν πατὴρ, John vi. 57), in contradistinction to the lifeless, inert, and inoperative idols; the living and the true God, who gives effectual proof of this character, and manifests Himself to, and in favour of, His worshippers. These are the elements for the conception (c) of God as a Spirit, which Jesus briefly pronounces Him to be (John iv. 24). As soon as the Samaritan woman recognised Him as a prophet, she pro-

pounded her leading religious question, seeking to know where men ought to worship, in Jerusalem or on the mountain of Samaria? The time will come, the Lord says, when men will worship God neither in the one nor the other place exclusively. The Samaritans, indeed, know not what they worship: they are wanting in the just apprehension of the object of their adoration, which the Jews possess, because salvation comes from them (ver. 22); and hence the Jewish people is the soil prepared by God from which the divine salvation is to issue. What has taken place by God's ordinance and guidance within the Jewish people is not, however, the limit of the change; but the hour is coming, nay, already come, when the true worshippers will worship the Father in spirit and in truth; for the Father seeks such to worship Him, and knows also how to prepare them for Himself, viz. by realizing the *σωτηρία* (ver. 22), which has its starting-point in the Jewish people. For (and now comes the reason for it) God is a Spirit (ver. 24); and those who worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth. The predicate *πνεῦμα* stands first for the sake of emphasis, and not as a Hebraism. The word is elsewhere used in contradistinction to what is corporeal (Luke xxiv. 39), a contrast being implied in this passage to anything subject to conditions of space. Were God in any wise comprehensible by any limits of space, His worship also would be confined within the same bounds; but as any such local limitation and determination are excluded by our Lord (ver. 21), it follows that the essential worship aimed at by the Father is raised above the possibility of being circumscribed by any such limitations. God as a Spirit is elevated not only above every local, but above every material condition and limitation, being in Himself the most perfect form of life, as the intelligent and Holy One who can only be approached in spirit and in truth. And in virtue of the Divine Spirit and the truth thus inwardly imparted, man is enabled to draw near in spirit to God with worship and adoration. Upon this idea of God as a Spirit rests also another which our Lord sets forth, that this God has life originally in Himself (John v. 26), and is therefore the fountain of all life (vers. 26 and 21), and incessantly in operation (John v. 17). He is the one true God (John xvii. 3), whom to know is everlasting life; He is the life to that extent that none can truly know Him without themselves becoming participators in the divine life. He is therefore

the ζῶν and ζωοποιῶν. Through this conception of God as a Spirit, everything else which Jesus taught concerning Him, for the production of a living faith,—which, too, is true even from an Old Testament point of view,—is placed in a peculiar light. The idea already implied in the Old Testament now more expressly culminates in the conception of a Spirit; for the same God who is a Spirit is also the Author of the world. And indeed because He is in Himself the absolutely perfect, self-conscious, holy, and active life, He is also the unconditionally free and gracious Author of the world. The dependence of the world on God appears not merely from the address to Him (Matt. xi. 25; Luke x. 21) as Lord of heaven and earth, but is pointed out as of universal extent, resting upon the fact of creation (καταβολή τοῦ κόσμου, John xvii. 24), and embracing, therefore, even the minutest objects. We see this in the discourses in which our Lord requires unconditional confidence in God (Matt. vi. 25–34), especially from the apostles in their calling (Luke xii. 4–7, cf. Matt. x. 28–31), and where He encourages to prayer (Matt. vii. 7–11, vi. 10–13; Luke xi. 1–8). It is further evident that God, on whom the world is absolutely dependent, is also represented in the teaching of Jesus as the *absolutely good*, since this dependence is put forward as a sufficient ground for unlimited confidence. Jesus also expressly teaches that God is *perfect*; as being the prototype of all moral perfection, and especially of all love (Matt. v. 48). God is verily the only good (There is none good but one, that is God, Matt. xix. 17; Luke xviii. 19), and is therefore the trustworthy Giver of all good gifts (Matt. vii. 9–11). In this absolute sense He alone is good, both in Himself and by communication to others; for the very conception of God as a Spirit implies that He is a self-comprehending and self-existent life, the holy and intelligent source of activity, but withal that His life and being is not limited to Himself, but is self-imparting. All this is, indeed, involved in the idea of the Spirit and the life, as these words are used absolutely of the Divine Being.

But on this very account our Lord's teaching does not stop here. The method He adopts is to assert the idea of Spirit only when He desires to draw some important inference from it; at other times, the leading idea on which He has formed the conception He would convey of God is of a different nature,—that of the *Father*. Hence the passages in which we recognise God as a

Spirit,—who is the perfect life in His relation to the world,—are exactly those in which our Lord does not merely call Him God and Spirit, but represents Him as Father; as, for instance, where He mentions His perfection (Matt. v. 48), and where He points to Him as the trustworthy Giver of good gifts (Matt. vii. 9-11). But we shall see hereafter how these two ideas—that *God is a Spirit*, and *God is a Father*—stand in an inner connection with each other. The opinion that Christ employed the term *Θεός* more in the presence of the Jews, and *πατήρ* to His disciples, is untenable; for we cannot regard the Sermon on the Mount, in which He chiefly used the latter term, as addressed exclusively to His disciples.

By this second leading definition of God as the *Father*, Christ complemented and perfected the Old Testament conception; for even this idea is not an entirely new one, but finds its counterpart in the Old Testament.

The living God, who reveals Himself to His own, is the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (Ex. iii. 6; Matt. xxii. 32; cf. Heb. xi. 17 ff.), the God of Israel, the Holy One of Israel. He avers Himself to be the absolutely existing and living One, and as standing in a peculiar covenant relation to the people of Israel, and first to their forefathers, who were specially called to the blessing, and therein to be the starting-point of a plan of salvation for mankind. But in the same way as Jesus briefly sums up the notion of the absolute and self-existent in the term *Spirit*, so He does that of the God of Abraham, etc., as *Father*, as in the expression “My Father and your Father” (John xx. 17). He appeals no more to the relation in which God stood to the nation and their forefathers, but takes His stand simply on what God is in Him, and for Him, and what therein He will be for all mankind. Here, too, the teaching of the Old Testament is brought to a climax in the idea of Jesus. The idea of Father, as occurring in the Old Testament, has in later times been erroneously referred to God as the Creator and beneficent Sustainer of mankind; and Mal. ii. 10 is specially appealed to in proof of this. The idea of God as the Father of all is said to be found here; but in this passage, according to the context, those who are said to have God as a common Father are only the members of the people of Israel, as we see from the end of the verse. Consequently, although we read, “Hath not one God created us?” we must suppose that it is only the general

idea of the Creator, modified by the special relation subsisting between Jehovah and the Israelites. This is confirmed by the remaining passages, in which God is spoken of as the Father in reference to the theocratic people, so far as it was chosen, constituted, and educated by God (Deut. xxxii. 6, and cf. generally the whole book as to God's fatherly guidance; also Isa. lxiii. 16, lxiv. 8, cf. 9-11; Jer. xxxi. 9, cf. iii. 19, where the people is called Jehovah's son; Ex. iv. 22; Jer. xxxi. 20; Hos. xi. 1; Deut. i. 31, viii. 5.) Moreover, the name of Father is applied to Jehovah not only in reference to the people as a whole, but also to individual members of it (Mal. ii. 10; Isa. lxiii. 16); and they are called His sons and daughters (Deut. xxxii. 19; Isa. i. 2, 4, lxiii. 8; Deut. xiv. 1). In any case, however, it is clear that God is not in the Old Testament called Father as Creator and Sustainer of merely animal life,—a physical notion which obtains more in the domain of heathenism (*Ζεὺς πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε*),—but in so far as He stands in a peculiar relation to one portion of mankind, and in a special covenant and closer spiritual communion with them. The idea is, in short, that of a spiritual and moral relationship. It cannot, therefore, be said that the idea of God is comprehended within narrow limits, because He is spoken of as Father of the Israelites only, but rather that it is taken in a higher sense; and, moreover, His people represent no more than the starting-point from which the paternal relationship should be extended to all the nations of the earth.

Jesus Himself determined the signification of the title of Father, by employing it in a double reference, partly to His own person, and partly to other men: in the former case most eminently in a unique, in the latter, in a wider and derivative sense. But in both it is not merely the Originator of natural life who is spoken of, but the Author and Prototype, as the Sustainer, Guardian, and Perfecter, of spiritual life, but in such a way as, whilst giving this the foremost place, not to exclude the other. In the former sense, the expression *ὁ πατήρ μου* often occurs, as, for example, Matt. xi. 27; John ii. 16, v. 17; and in the latter at Matt. vi. 4, 6, 8; and we also meet with *πατήρ ὑμῶν* (Matt. vi. 8, 15, x. 20, 29, xxiii. 9; Luke vi. 36, xii. 30, 32), the *Father* of the *righteous* (Matt. xiii. 43); and the expression "*Our Father*" is put into the mouth of believers (Matt. vi. 9). In the second reference we frequently find the addition *ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς*, or *ὁ*

οὐράνιος (Matt. v. 16, 45, 48, vi. 1, 9, 14, 26, 32, vii. 11; Mark xi. 25), or ἐξ οὐρανοῦ (Luke xi. 13). But in the first reference also the same addition occurs, in order to prevent all mistake (Matt. vii. 21, x. 32, xii. 50, xvi. 17, xviii. 10); and it originates in the predominant view of the Old Testament that God dwells in heaven, raised far above every human and earthly condition (Ps. cxv. 3). Hence also the rabbis, in speaking of God as the Father, call Him *the heavenly*,—no doubt to distinguish Him from earthly fathers (cf. Matt. vii. 11). As regards the proper signification of the title, it is generally to be understood in reference to men, that God is called their Father not merely as the Author of their natural life. It is also strange that, when God is called Father in the Bible, this is not done with respect to nature and irrational beings, but to men and angelic spirits. It follows, therefore, that God must be understood as the Author of a life resembling His own. Nor must it be overlooked that, as has been already shown in the Old Testament, this conception of Father is not extended to all men. Thus, since the title is not applied to Him in the Old Testament in virtue of His relation to all mankind, the reflection comes in that, because men are alienated from God by sin and become morally unlike and indeed opposed to Him, the name of Father belongs to God only in reference to those with whom He stands in peculiar covenant-relation. The names of Father and child are used in the sense of spiritual and moral relationship. Thus (Matt. v. 45) men are children of their heavenly Father if they are like Him in spiritual and moral respects, inwardly pervaded by the same spiritual life, especially by the same love as it exists in Him; and if they distinguish themselves thereby from sinners, in whom the sinful life prevails (compare also John viii. 39 ff.). The Jews are not children of Abraham, although his bodily σπέρμα (ver. 37); they do not resemble him in their actions (ver. 40), but are in that respect rather children of the devil (ver. 44); and hence the connection of spiritual relationship is implied in the sonship of Abraham (cf. also the υἱοὶ τοῦ πονηροῦ, Matt. xiii. 38, and the application of the term υἱὸς Ἀβραάμ to Zacchæus, Luke xix. 9). Also, in His powerful closing discourse against the Pharisees, our Lord speaks in the same way (Matt. xxiii. 31, 32; cf. Luke xi. 47) of spiritual sonship in opposition to the forefathers who persecuted the prophets. But as above mentioned (John viii.), they are not Abraham's seed;

in consequence of their doings, they prove also that they are not the children of God (John viii. 42, 47; cf. also the *εἶναι ἐκ τοῦ διαβόλου*, ver. 44, with *εἶναι ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ*, ver. 47; also the parable of the good seed and of the tares of the field). We see plainly from this, that the spiritual relationship denoted in the names of Father and child is such as to include on one side the causality of determinate spiritual life. God is Father, and man His child, not merely through the giving and receiving of natural life,—even if it be one endowed with reason,—but so far as God, on the basis of this life, sets Himself in a relation of spiritual community with man, cherishes and perfects him as standing in moral and spiritual relations with Himself. Thus, then, God as Father is love exhibited in action, the loving Author of the inner life spiritually and morally allied to Himself; and, as the Author, so also the Sustainer of it, who cherishes and brings it to perfection. This appears in our Lord's words (Matt. vii. 9-11; Luke xi. 11-13), where the idea of paternal love already exhibited in sinful humanity is enhanced by application to a God who is absolutely good and perfect. So, too (Matt. xviii. 14; Luke xv. 2 ff.; cf. Matt. xix. 26, xviii. 23), the idea of the divine paternal love is developed as the consummation of pastoral fidelity in man (ver. 23). See also what we read in St. John (iii. 16, xvii. 2) of the love of God. In this spiritual and moral fatherly relation lie the two essential points of the Christian conception of God, which are, on the one side, *His absolute elevation above the world and men*, in contradistinction from whom He is the Almighty and the Holy One; and, on the other, *the most intimate communion between their life and His*, proceeding from the original relationship of creation, and from the free self-imparting love of God. These two elements combined complete the Christian conception of God; and their union is established by Christ Himself, through the simple conception of the Father.

But although the Father is the originator and founder of a spiritual and moral communion between Himself and the life of which He is the Author, yet the relation is not confined to the men whose Father in this sense God is, nor even to superhuman beings, such as the angels, to whom the expression *υἱοὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ* is undoubtedly applied by our Lord (Luke xx. 36), as if to point out the higher super-terrestrial condition which men may hope to attain after death, but it attains perfection in its application to

the Son, whose Father God is in the highest sense of the word (cf. Matt. xi. 27¹). He is, as our Lord says, "My God and your God," "My Father and your Father" (John xx. 17); and how sonship of men with God proceeds from that of Jesus is seen in John xvii. 26, xiv. 6-13.

He therefore speaks of God chiefly as *His Father*, both according to the synoptic evangelists and St. John; and this is so common in our Lord's discourses, that, besides what has been already said, no other passages need be adduced in proof of it. But there are also certain utterances in which the idea of God as Father, in relation to the Son, is more distinctly brought out, mostly in St. John ch. v. (cf. xiv.-xvii.), where Christ takes advantage of the charge brought against Him of profaning the Sabbath by His miracles, to enter more thoroughly into the subject of His relation to the Father. He works, He says, because and as the Father works, and expresses Himself in such a way as to show the Jews that He was speaking of God as His Father in the precise sense of the word, making Himself, as they expressed it, equal with God (ver. 18); so that our Lord was induced to enter into a closer explanation of the relation subsisting between Himself and the Father. This relation can only be completely ascertained by a consideration of the idea of the Son also; and to this belongs the truth that the Father has life in Himself (ver. 26) absolutely as the sole cause. The Son, too, has life in Himself, but as imparted by the Father: the Father has given to the Son to have life in Himself. Hence, also, it is the Father who imparts the life, and grants it to the Son in so comprehensive a sense, that the Son Himself also can then quicken whom He will (ver. 21), and can, moreover, do all that the Father does by virtue of this fulness of life and the knowledge which accompanies it (vers. 19-21). On this account a relation of love subsists between the Son and the Father, and, on the other hand, the Father loves the Son (ver. 19, x. 17, xvii. 24, 26). This communion, originating in the Father, is one both of knowledge

¹ This might have been taken as the starting-point of the inquiry, because the relation of God to men is brought about by that in which He stands absolutely as Father to the Son. But as our Lord Himself adopts the other method, proceeding from the lower to the higher sense of the term, and teaching men to know God in the first place as the Father of those who are called into His kingdom, the same plan has been followed here.

and of action, as set forth in vers. 19 and 20, ὁμοίως ποιεῖ and πάντα δείκνυσιν αὐτῷ. The community of knowledge is emphatically asserted (Matt. xi. 25-27; Luke x. 21, 22), and rests upon the community of life and being (cf. John xiv. 7). For other passages, cf. John xvii. 1, 21, 24, 25; Matt. x. 32, 33, xvi. 17, 27, xxv. 34, xx. 23, where Christ speaks of God as His Father in the higher sense; for God is Father in the most special sense of the word as regards the Son; and by that very fact brings about His relation as Father to the children of God amongst mankind and in the higher world. Thus God's love for the Son from all eternity passes over to those who believe on Him (John xvii. 26, cf. also xvi. 27); and the same idea runs through the whole connection of His teaching. God is pre-eminently Father of the Son, to whom He has given to have life in Himself and to quicken whomsoever He will, and also full power over all flesh, to give life to those whom the Father has given Him (John xvii. 2). But on that account God is also the Father of those who believe on the Son, and are thereby children of God. And thus is God, in the fullest and richest sense, the Author of life; and the life which He gives is a divine life, and, indeed, a spiritual communion with Himself in love. And this is exactly the point where we see that the two leading ideas—of God as a Father, and God as a Spirit—formed by our Lord, and in which His teaching of God culminates, stand in close internal connection with each other. He taught men to know God as πνεῦμα, as being the absolute and perfect life, self-comprehensive in complete self-consciousness and spontaneous activity, and imparting Himself to others; the notion of this self-communication and thoroughly permeating influence being contained in the idea of the Spirit, whence also the inference as to the worship of God is immediately deduced (John iv. 24). But God as Father is likewise the intelligent and spiritual Author of life. The idea intermediate to those of Father and Spirit is that God is love, the highest conception of personality. The idea of Father includes that of love, and the latter is presupposed in that of the Spirit. And it is observable that the apostle, who alone has recorded the apophthegm "God is love" (1 John iv. 8), the truth contained in which lies at the foundation of all our Lord's teaching, is the same who has also alone preserved to us Jesus' utterance πνεῦμα ὁ Θεός. In virtue of this love, God communicates life, and

founds a spiritual fellowship of life and love between Himself and rational creatures as His children. The conclusion as to God's worship, which Christ draws (John iv. 22-24) from the conception of Him as Spirit, is also derived elsewhere from the idea of Father (Matt. vi. 3-8), where the subject of discourse is the purity of piety in almsgiving and prayer, with a hint at the omniscience of God as Father.

From this conception of the Divine Being as God and Father, proceeds the more special teaching of Jesus as to the *divine attributes*; and this idea forms the basis of all the predicates He applies to the Father in His manifold discourses. He is the one *true God* (ὁ μόνος ἀληθινός, John xvii. 3; cf. v. 44, vii. 28; Mark xii. 29), the knowledge of whom is eternal life; who is in His own person so absolutely the life eternal that no one can know Him without attaining that life. The knowledge of Him is an appropriation of the divine life, and unattainable without it; for He who originally possesses the life in Himself is the source whence it is imparted to others (John v. 21, 26, iii. 15, 16, vi. 32, 33).

He is, as a Spirit, *omniscient* with reference partly to the Son, whom He alone knows (Matt. xi. 27), and partly to the world (Matt. vi. 8, 32, cf. x. 30). This is also confirmed by the divine prophecy which Jesus presupposes and accepts in His teaching.

He is *almighty*, so that all things are possible to Him (Matt. xix. 26; Luke xviii. 27; Mark xiv. 36), especially the raising of the dead to spiritual and physical life (John v. 21). He is, consequently, greater than all (John x. 29), so that everything is dependent on and ordered by Him (Matt. x. 29, 30), and especially possesses full power over men, both in this life and the next (Luke xii. 4, 5); being, moreover, in a state of constant activity, so that no distinction between this and a state of rest can find place with Him (John v. 17).

God is likewise *omnipresent* (Matt. vi. 4, 6, 18), and also *eternal* (John xvii. 5, 24). He is not limited by the temporal conditions of the world, but, as its Founder and Creator, originally superior to it.

This living incomprehensible God is *holy* (John xvii. 11), in contradistinction from the world and sin, since He is not only untainted by, but in His own nature safe and free from, it; holy, therefore, not merely in a negative but in a positive sense, and imparting holiness to others.

He alone, therefore, is *good* (Matt. xix. 17; Luke xviii. 19), and the trustworthy giver of all good gifts (Matt. vii. 9–11). He alone, too, is *true* (*ἀληθής*),—John viii. 26, cf. vers. 14–18, ver. 32, and perhaps also John vii. 28 (*ἀληθινός*),—revealing Himself as He is, and therefore also bearing witness to the truth. He is full of *love* towards the world (John iii. 16), and therefore *benign* to all creatures who are in need, even to the irrational creation (Matt. vi. 26, 28–30), but especially to mankind as standing in a higher position, insomuch that it is enough for men, with regard to their wants, to be assured that God their Father knows of them. And this holds good, not only of bodily wants, which are here spoken of (as also in Matt. v. 45), and for which all men indiscriminately, without reference to their moral conduct, are supplied with what is necessary for the prolongation of their natural life, as a foundation for the superstructure of a higher state of existence. It refers also, generally, to everything which can be the subject of desire, demand, or prayer, in so far as it is a good gift, and in the highest degree to spiritual wants, and to the highest gift of all, the Holy Ghost Himself (Luke xi. 13), and to the kingdom of God (Luke xii. 31, 32), to the possession of which all other good things shall be added (Matt. vi. 33).

So far, then, as the needy are suffering and miserable, this benevolent God is the *Merciful One* (Luke vi. 36); so far as they are sinners, He is *gracious*,—that is, ready to blot out the sins of those who yield themselves to His counsel of grace (Matt. xviii. 23–27, 32, 33 [*ἐλεεῖν—σπλαγχνισθῆναι*]; Luke xviii. 13; Matt. xviii. 12–14; Luke xv. 11–32, cf. 4–10). Thus God approaches sinners in fatherly love, with forgiveness and benefits, deliverance and protection from evil (Matt. vi. 12–14), leading sinners from death and sin to life and righteousness (Luke xviii. 14), as the great God to whose power and pity nothing is impossible (Mark x. 27; Luke xviii. 27); so that entrance into the kingdom of God, which is impossible to the sinner as such, becomes both possible and actual through God's power and grace (Matt. xix. 23, 26; cf. Mark x. 23). On the other hand, He is *patient* and *long-suffering*, *i.e.* sparing even the yet unconverted sinner so as to allow room for his conversion; long-suffering enough to grant to each according to his need sufficient time for repentance (Luke xiii. 6–9).

But, inasmuch as the holy, true, and benevolent God regards

and treats all rational beings with reference to the conduct which may be justly imputed to them, He is the Righteous (*δίκαιος*, John xvii. 25). This term is not synonymous with *ἅγιος* (ver. 11), since the latter attribute, taken in connection with its context, places God in opposition to sin: being free from, and untainted by sin, He repels it from Him, and is perfectly safe from its attacks. In the former passage, on the contrary, *δίκαιος* points to the distinction between the *κόσμος* and the Redeemer with those who believe on Him, and accordingly lays down a different line of conduct on God's part towards these two parties; so that it exactly designates the divine attribute by which He regards and treats His subjects according to the behaviour which may justly be imputed to them,—an attribute of the divine being which by no means invalidates the others. To the province of the divine righteousness belongs the question of God's judgments (John v. 22, 27, 29), especially when He is represented, on the one hand, as jealous, angry, and condemnatory, in respect of the despisers of His kindness and forbearance and generally of His will (Matt. xviii. 34, 35, xxii. 11–13, xxiii. 12, xxv. 26–29, 41–46; cf. Luke xiv. 21, xii. 46), but, on the other hand, as recompensing and compensating the good (Matt. v. 11, 12, vi. 4, 6, 18, xxv. 21, 29, 34); where, however, it must not be overlooked that in so requiting the good, His freedom of action is quite unrestrained (Matt. xx. 13–15). It is, then, this living and illimitable, holy, loving, and righteous God in whom *wisdom* dwells (Luke xi. 49; Matt. xi. 19). In all these attributes He proves Himself to be the *perfect One* (Matt. v. 45), perfect on every side, internally in Himself and externally in His works, and therefore the prototype of all moral perfection, and especially of all love; but in this perfection always manifesting Himself to be God, the Spirit and Father.

This doctrine of the Father is the foundation on which all else is built up, the root from which springs the whole stem and tree of our Lord's teaching, limited at first to the doctrine of the glorification of the Father in the Son, but embracing afterwards its whole extent.

§ 22. *The Son.*

In § 21 we recognised the religious doctrines of the Old Testament as being essential and fundamental hypotheses in our Lord's teaching; and although the New Testament element comes

in more largely here, still the idea is rooted in the Old Testament. The relation subsisting absolutely between the Father and the Son now first comes prominently into the foreground. The teaching of the Lord on this point is direct self-testimony, the revelation by Himself of His own self-consciousness, and the attestation of this consciousness; and to this testimony is due the whole peculiarity of our Lord's teaching and of the religious doctrines contained in the New Testament. The peculiar and unique sense in which God is absolutely the Father here first shows itself.

In the Old Testament it was in the first place the theocratic nation which was regarded as the son of God, Israel as the first-born son (Ex. iv. 22; Jer. xxxi. 9-20); then the members of this people as sons and daughters, or children of this God; and thirdly, as a son in the most eminent sense, the earthly representative of the people, the chief minister of the covenant, and at the same time God's deputy amongst the people, the theocratic king. And now this relation culminates in the future Anointed One, in the absolute sense of that term.

Jesus points Himself out as the Son simply, where, in the context, the reference applies to the Father (Matt. xi. 27; John v. 19). But in its deeper sense He gradually unfolds the doctrine of His Sonship, at first preparing His countrymen, and then leading on into its depths those who were capable of embracing it. On one occasion, at Jerusalem, He asserts His dignity before a mixed multitude; but this did not occur in the earlier days of His ministry. To this method belong also the titles *Son of Man* and *Son of God*, which, both in the Synoptists and in John, He is represented as using, which are indissolubly united, and mutually complete each other.

The name *Son of man*, *υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*, is found most frequently in the Synoptists, and almost exclusively in the mouth of Jesus Himself. The Son of man appears as a man among men, and is described as having neither property nor home (Matt. viii. 20; Luke ix. 58); He eats and drinks (Matt. xi. 19; Luke vii. 34); He can forgive sins (Matt. ix. 6; Mark ii. 10; Luke v. 24); He is Lord of the Sabbath (Matt. xii. 8; Mark ii. 28; Luke vi. 5); He is the sower of the parable (Matt. xiii. 37, 41); He is come to save (Matt. xviii. 11; Luke xix. 10), and to minister (Matt. xx. 28; Mark x. 45). The disciples are desired to say for whom they

take Him (Matt. xvi. 13). Sin against Him is not without forgiveness (Matt. xii. 32; Luke xii. 10); the sign of Jonas is fulfilled in Him (Matt. xii. 40; Luke xi. 30). He must fulfil the pre-ordained and predicted destiny of His life (Matt. xxvi. 44); must suffer, be rejected, betrayed by the kiss of a Judas (Luke xxii. 48), and delivered up into the hands of sinners, ill-treated and crucified (Luke xxiv. 7; Mark viii. 31; Luke ix. 22; [Matt. xvi. 21;] Matt. xvii. 12; Mark ix. 12; Matt. xvii. 22 f.; Mark ix. 31; Luke ix. 44; Matt. xx. 18 f.; Mark x. 33 f.; Luke xviii. 31 ff.; Matt. xxvi. 2; Matt. xxvi. 24; Mark xiv. 21; Luke xxii. 22; Matt. xxvi. 45; Mark xiv. 41; Luke xxii. 48); but He will rise again (Matt. xvii. 9; Mark ix. 9; Matt. xvii. 23; Mark ix. 31; Matt. xx. 19; Mark x. 34; Luke xviii. 33); and a great future with the Father, and a return in glory for the establishment of His kingdom and for judgment, is in store for Him (Matt. x. 23, xvi. 27 f.; Mark viii. 38; Luke ix. 26; Matt. xix. 28, xxiv. 27; Luke xvii. 22, 24; Matt. xxiv. 30 f.; Mark xiii. 26; Luke xxi. 27 f.; Matt. xxiv. 37, 39; Luke xvii. 26, 30; Matt. xxiv. 44; Luke xii. 40, 21, 36; Matt. xxv. 31; Matt. xxvi. 64; Luke xxii. 69). Men will be persecuted for His sake (Luke vi. 22; cf. Matt. v. 10); He will be ashamed of those who are ashamed of Him (Mark viii. 38; Luke ix. 26); but He will, on the other hand, confess those who confess Him (Luke xii. 8; cf. Matt. x. 32); and they will desire Him (Luke xvii. 22, 24, 25). The question is also asked, whether He shall find faith on the earth? (Luke xviii. 8.) In John's Gospel, also, the expression is really used, if not so frequently and variously as in the Synoptists (cf. John i. 52, iii. 13, 14, v. 27). For other examples of the expression in John, see vi. 27, 53, 62, viii. 28, xii. 23, 34, xiii. 31.

We see from the foregoing how manifold the use of this expression is, and also that there is evidently a purpose in it. It is at any rate characteristic, that it hardly ever occurs beyond the limits of the gospel histories. We find it only once directly used from the lips of the dying Stephen (Acts vii. 56). He had known our Lord during His life on earth, and at the moment of being stoned he beheld Him in a vision, and naturally employed the expression which our Lord had in His time so frequently employed. The expression is used in another way in Rev. i. 13, xiv. 14, with manifest reference to Dan. vii. 13.

We have next to inquire as to the meaning of the expression

literally ; and, apart from all historical reference, it means nothing but *man*, in the same sense as *υἱοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων* (Mark iii. 28), children of men. In the Old Testament we find the expression frequently in Ezekiel (*e.g.* xl. 4, xlv. 5), in the mouth of the prophet's angelic conductor, to distinguish himself as the super-human spirit, and for the purpose of awakening a feeling of dependence on God and His messenger. But why then does Jesus thus call Himself a child of man ?

Rationalism has pronounced *ὁ υἱὸς τ. ἀ.* to mean *the man here*, according to the manner of the Orientals, who avoid the term *I*, and are desirous to put themselves into connection with the person they are addressing, as "thy servant," "thine handmaid," etc. It makes strongly against this interpretation that the pronoun *οὗτος* is never added to the expression, often as it is supposed to occur in this sense ; and its so frequent use becomes simply incomprehensible. Passages such as Matt. xvi. 13 would, on this supposition, become unmeaning ; but, so far from this being the case, the expression clearly has reference, wherever it occurs, to the peculiarity of the person of Jesus. The ideal explanation must therefore go still further, and allow that Christ called Himself the Son of man, in order to signify the special peculiarity of His personality, and to specify Himself in this important respect, in a way which was well adapted, by its delicate and quiet intimation, to shape itself into some more full and comprehensive conception of the idea. Just the same may be said of the expression *βασίλεια τοῦ Θεοῦ*, which He found in use, and could employ without exciting too great a sensation. For He made use of it in such a way that it was possible for Him, by gradually drawing out the notion He wished to impart, to bring it nearer home to the people, and thereby to ennoble and spiritualize their conception of the Messianic kingdom, before He openly stepped forth before the world with the declaration that He was Himself the Messiah, the ruler of this kingdom. But this gives rise to the question, whether we are justified in adhering to the merely literal explanation of the expression, or whether it was not rather used historically as a designation of the Messiah ? Many assume that Jesus wished thereby to make Himself known as the Messiah pointed out by Daniel (ch. vii. 13). The great authority attributed at that time to the prophet Daniel on the subject of Messianic prophecy, as well as the fact that the later Jews called the Messiah with re-

ference to this passage the *Son of clouds*, is appealed to in support of this opinion. Schleiermacher, on the other hand, speaks of it as a strange conceit; and certainly it cannot be proved that the expression was in current use at the time of Jesus as a designation of the Messiah (John xii. 34; cf. Matt. xvi. 13). Again, it is not consistent with the character of Jesus merely to borrow an oft-recurring expression, without at the same time intentionally giving to it, though adopted from some other source, an original and characteristic signification. And, lastly, the purport of the passages in which He makes use of this expression obliges us at all events to go beyond the bare allusion to Daniel, and to connect the purport of these utterances with the verbal sense of the designation. But although we give due weight to these considerations, it would surely be going too far to deny, with Schleiermacher, that the expression *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* was in no way historically suggested by that passage of Daniel. For instance, there can be no doubt that in our Lord's own utterances respecting His person He makes definite allusion to that passage (Matt. xxiv. 30; cf. Mark xiii. 26; Luke xxi. 27, 36; in close connection with Matt. xxvi. 64, cf. Mark xiv. 62; Luke xxii. 69). In these passages He says, as in Dan. vii. 13, that the Son of man shall come in or upon the clouds of heaven; wherein we have this twofold assertion about the coming king, that He is like a Son of man, and that He comes in the clouds of heaven. Our Lord here evidently intends His hearers to recall to mind that passage of Daniel, and also to regard Himself as there indicated. Thus it is certainly most probable that this passage induced Jesus to choose the name *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* for Himself; and this opinion is strengthened by the fact that the book of Enoch also has the expression *Son of man*. And by means of this passage great advantage accrued from His use of the expression, that His fellow-countrymen would, on closer examination, be led to discover in it a designation of His person as the Messiah, and be thus gradually initiated into the deeper and higher sense of the Messianic idea, without the risk of popular excitement which would have been incurred by an explicit declaration of His Messiahship. But in order to exhaust its meaning, we must connect the literal and ideal with the historical explanation, by adding to the historical sense the signification of the expression itself. Jesus uses this expression emphatically to denote Himself to be "a man;" in Grotius' view, to describe His lowliness, in Herder's

opinion, to represent Himself as the ideal man. Thus much at least is certain, that in the idea of man both views are combined,—lowliness and weakness in relation to some higher being, dignity and elevation as compared with a less exalted creature. In the Old Testament we have the two beautifully united in Ps. viii. 5, where the nature and position of men are so remarkably stated as to become the type for the Messianic personality in the New Testament (cf. Heb. ii. 6-8). It is indeed strange that the passage just quoted is not (as well as that in Daniel) usually taken into account in explaining the expression Son of man.

With regard to the use of the *υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* in our Lord's mouth, Schleiermacher justly says that He could not have applied it to Himself without the consciousness of His own complete participation in human nature; and, further, that the special appropriation of it would have been unmeaning except He had some ground for it which others could not claim, in giving to it some pregnant sense indicating a marked distinction between Himself and other men.

What kind of a distinction, then, is this? It is said, and truly, that our Lord was a man in the most distinguished sense of the word; but this distinction points to something else, viz. that He was not merely a man, but more than a man, in virtue of the union of a superhuman with His human nature, the former of which became man in Him in the highest sense of the word. Two points are, therefore, always implied in the expression Son of man, viz. that, although veritably the Son of man, He was at the same time something much higher still, and on the other side, that, exalted as He was, in the strict sense of the word He was still a man—a man in all human lowliness, and yet in the highest perfection. An antithesis is hinted at in the expression Son of man; and this is easily accounted for if we remember that He quite as frequently calls Himself the Son of God.

This pregnantly comprehensive conception of the *Son of man*, brought home to us by what has been said above, will be further verified by examination of the particular passages in which it occurs.

The synoptic passages.—The contrast above mentioned shows itself most distinctly in Matt. xvi. 13-16 (cf. Mark viii., Luke ix.). "Whom do men say that I the Son of man am?" was the question addressed by our Lord to His disciples. The opinions entertained of Him by others having been mentioned, our Lord

comes forward with the question, "Whom say ye that I am?" to which they reply, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God;" this being the sum of what they had learned and experienced in their intercourse with Jesus. Here then the *υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* and the *υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ* are shown to be united in the same person; and in ver. 27, where we read that "the Son of man" will come in the glory "of His Father," the two persons are similarly identified. For the juxtaposition proves that the Son of man has God for His Father, and in such a way that the glory of God is also His own, and that in which He will hereafter come and manifest Himself. This general view is entirely confirmed by the remaining passages.

The Son of man *appears as a man* amongst men, resembling other men in His manner of life (Matt. xi. 19; Luke vii. 34), descending, indeed, still lower, and fulfilling, as prophesied, a hard lot in life, with no possessions or resting-place on earth (Matt. viii. 20; Luke ix. 58). He treads the path of suffering and death, and is given over into the hands of sinners, betrayed by the kiss of Judas, maltreated, crucified, and slain by wicked men (cf. Matt. xx. 18, and other passages quoted at p. 109 above).

He accomplishes His work on earth, and indeed forgives sins, but still whilst in all human lowliness (Matt. ix. 6 and ||). He is Lord even of the Sabbath, but still in earthly lowliness (Matt. xii. 8 and ||). He is a sower come to sow good seed amongst mankind (Matt. xiii. 37); to seek and to save the lost (Matt. xviii. 11; Luke xix. 10), being not ashamed to interest Himself for them, but Himself ministering to mankind by the sacrifice of His life (Matt. xx. 28; Mark x. 45). And because He appears in such lowliness, He finds faith in few hearts only (Luke xviii. 8, vi. 22, ix. 26; Mark viii. 38), nay, excites opposition so easily that a man may be guilty of blasphemy against Him without committing an unpardonable sin (Matt. xii. 32; Luke xii. 20). But in spite of this insignificance, as the Son of man He will not only rise from the dead on the third day (Matt. xvii. 9), but also reappear one day in His glorious kingdom to judge the world, and will acknowledge or deny men, not only before the angels of God, but also before the Father (Mark viii. 38; Luke ix. 26; Luke xii. 8 ff.; [Matt. x. 32;] cf. Luke vi. 22, xvii. 22), and will reign supreme on the throne of His glory (Matt. xix. 28).

With this element of our Lord's teaching agrees also the historical representation given by the Synoptists of the Messianic life

of Jesus. They represent Him as the Son of man born of a human mother (Matthew and Luke, and Gal. iv. 4), and fulfilling a human destiny; but withal as borne witness to both by the voice of the Father as His Son at His baptism and transfiguration, and also by His own self-testimony, and His resurrection and ascension. There is, in the first place, a man, but one in whom the glory of the Son of God breaks forth amidst the obscurity of His human lowliness. The very course, indeed, of His earthly life is to reveal this life as in truth that of the Son of God.

The passages in John likewise point to the union of the two contrasting elements in the unity of the person of Jesus. Although we must not stop short there, we may therefore well adopt what Neander says in his *Life of Jesus*, that "He thus calls Himself, as one who, partaking of humanity, has worked out such great results for human nature, through which results our nature is glorified, who also most eminently answers to the ideal of man, and realizes the prototype of humanity." In proof of this, he refers (besides Matt. xii. 8) to John i. 52, iii. 13, v. 27, vi. 53. In our view, the essential point is the perfect union of the Son of man and Son of God in the person of Jesus. We base our view on John iii. 13: "No man hath ascended up to heaven (in relation first to knowledge, ver. 11) but He who came down from heaven, even the Son of man, who is in heaven," that is to say, the originally super-human one who became man, but in whose earthly life a heavenly life co-exists; who therefore holds communion with the angels, and partakes of their services (i. 52). Having come from heaven to earth, He is possessed also of divine knowledge, and bears witness on earth to heavenly truths (vers. ~~11~~ 11, 12), being lifted up, indeed, as the divinely-appointed sign,—all-powerful to heal the serpent's bite (ver. 14); but to Him, at the same time, all judgment is committed by the Father (v. 27). He it is who, as the one sealed by the Father (vi. 27), and as the bread of life which comes down from heaven (vers. 32-38), is able to give men the food which endureth even unto eternal life. He is man as none other, who in His flesh and blood has rendered incarnate the divine, making the purely human element a form of manifestation for the divine, whom man must take into himself and allow to pervade his being; who, therefore, offered His flesh and blood for their abiding use (ver. 53). He will at the last be exalted again into heaven (vi. 62); certainly through suffering and the cross (viii. 28,

xii. 32, 34), by which, however, He will be most gloriously manifested. And the historical representation of the life of Jesus, as given by St. John, agrees with this. In his prologue, in describing Him whom he desires to bear witness to as the Messiah, he represents Him as the Word who was in the beginning with God, who was Himself God, and became flesh. He is thus represented from the very first as the Son of God. His divine nature is put in the foremost place; and the Baptist, with whose testimony the historical account opens, bears direct witness to Him as the Son of God, by virtue of the manifestation which took place at His baptism (i. 34 [33]). This Son of God is at the same time the Son of man; and in the latter name is clearly set forth by St. John the perfect union of the two distinct elements. This difference, however, is to be noticed, that whereas in the Synoptists the account of the Son of man takes the foremost place, He being shown in His Messianic life to be also the Son of God, St. John, on the contrary, gives the precedence to the idea of the Son of God, manifested indeed as a man throughout the whole course of His life, although the beams of His glory as the only-begotten of the Father are continually breaking through. Both representations, however, agree in giving the Messianic life as the life of Him in whom exists the perfect union of the Son of man and Son of God.

The second, but less common, title of distinction, is *Son of God*, *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ* or *υἱὸς Θεοῦ*; or, still more frequently, *Son* only, yet always in reference to God the Father, and therefore equivalent to God's Son (Matt. xi. 27, cf. Luke x. 22; Mark xiii. 32; Matt. xxviii. 19; John v. 19–23, 26, vi. 40, compared with 44; viii. 36, cf. 38), whence also He oftener calls God *πατὴρ* than *Θεός*. And, besides the utterances in which the Lord styles Himself merely *Son*, but with reference to God the Father, the name Son of God expressly occurs (John iii. 16, 17, 18), where, too, He is called *ὁ υἱὸς ὁ μονογενής*. These verses, indeed, are sometimes regarded, even by commentators who accept the gospel as genuine and authentic, not as the words of Jesus, but as added by the evangelist, possibly with reference to 1 John iv. 9; but no proof of this is adduced. But, on a closer consideration of the whole paragraph (John iii. 16–21), it appears to be a perfectly appropriate continuation and conclusion of the conversation with Nicodemus, who (after ver. 11) offered no further interpellation, as in the earlier part of the interview, but after our Lord's reproof

(ver. 10), as well as throughout the profound explanations which followed (vers. 11-15), was so riveted as to become a willing disciple, and acknowledged his Master as a Teacher come from God (ver. 2; cf. further John v. 23, ix. 35, cf. 37, x. 36, xi. 4, cf. 37). The name *υἱὸς Θεοῦ* can, however, only be perfectly understood by combining the historical and ideal conceptions of it. Evidently, however, the New Testament has regard to the Old Testament foundation for this idea of God's Son. In the Old Testament the expression is used in a theocratic sense. Israel is the first-born son of God, and the chosen amongst the nations of the earth, even him of whom it is said in Hos. xi. 1, "Out of Egypt have I called my son;" and hence individual members of this nation are children of the covenant of God. And as the name *servant of Jehovah* is applied to Israel and pious Israelites generally, and then transferred to pre-eminent individuals, instruments of God's will, so are the distinguished representatives of God's people in an especial sense sons of God, but always with a higher reference in the background to the anointed and theocratic King, the Messiah, in whom the idea would culminate. Thus we find the Son of God, in the theocratic sense, as the ground-work of the Messianic promises and hopes of David (2 Sam. vii. 12-16, especially ver. 14; Ps. lxxxix. 28 (27), and with the whole context, vers. 20-28, also Ps. ii. 7). In the psalm last quoted the conception of a theocratic king is further worked out, and has from very early times been understood of the Messiah, especially the 7th verse, which St. Paul (Acts xiii. 33) quotes as referring to the resurrection of Christ (cf. Rom. i. 4). In the idea of Son of God is involved that of a peculiar similarity to, and fellowship with Him, and therein a special position both as regards God and also His people, to whom He was the representative of God, as of the highest theocratic King; and, on the other hand, He is also a representative of God's people, whose attributes as the sons of God culminate in that kingly capacity. The same idea, however, was still further worked out in the prophets through the gradual multiplication of attributes ascribed to the Messiah. And thus it is evident how the passage above quoted might form the basis for a much fuller elaboration of the conception of the Son of God.

Now, supposing this idea to have been already brought forward in the Old Testament, it is very probable that Jesus, in assuming the name, had reference to it; and the more so if it can be

credibly shown that the name was in use amongst our Lord's contemporaries without reference to His perfecting of the idea. We do actually find it in use, at all events, amongst those about the person of Jesus; but the question arises, how far the employment of it was owing to His influence? Yet as regards the disciples, the expression is used (John i. 50) by Nathanael, when he had hardly come into contact with Jesus at all (cf. vers. 42 and 46). Here it is evidently employed, in the first place, in a theocratic sense, but with an upward tendency, which already indicates something more than other kings of Israel. We find the expression also in the mouth of Peter (Matt. xvi. 16), and likewise of Martha (John xi. 27); in both cases, no doubt, on occasions where the influence of Jesus may be presupposed. But the connection of the words, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," makes it likely that it is the designation of the Messiah as such, and indicates that the use of the word here is connected with and rests upon the theocratic idea of the Old Testament; yet we must allow that from the lips of these two persons it is the utterance of an impression upon their minds of the person of Jesus, which had carried them beyond the merely theocratic idea. More decisive is the passage in which the high priest, at the examination which he instituted into the Messianic claims of Jesus, made use of the same title (Matt. xxvi. 63; cf. Luke xxii. 67-71; Mark xiv. 61). It may be here assumed that the high priest wished to express the common traditionary notion of the Messiah; and in the same way, too, we find it employed by the common people (Matt. xxvii. 40). It is also expressed by the demons (Matt. viii. 29), and by Satan himself as the tempter (Matt. iv. 3). Now it has been well said, by Olshausen for instance, that in all these utterances the expression *υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ* contains a close definition of the Messianic idea, which would set forth in Jesus the nature of the Father; and that those who called Him by this name either acknowledged in Him the Messiah manifesting the nature of the Father, or because they blamed Him for declaring Himself in that character. The disciples first applied the name to Him after, in their intercourse with Him, the nature of the Son was made known to them by revelation of God the Father, whilst they immediately recognised Him as the Messiah. The utterance of the high priest refers to Jesus' own declarations; and the words of the possessed are intended to express that even

the demoniacal power recognised the true nature of Jesus. Apart from the last, which may be regarded as a peculiar case, we may notice, firstly, that the tempter's words (Matt. iv.) distinctly refer to the heavenly voice which pointed out Jesus at His baptism as the Son of God, in whom the Father was well pleased (iii. 17); so that from that time forward the Lord walked the earth as the Son of God, who had been testified to from heaven. And as regards the declarations of the disciples, all of them at least could not be derived from more intimate knowledge of His person, because Nathanael calls Him by that name at their first interview. And, whilst it cannot be shown that the high priest did not employ the term *υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ* as explanatory of *ὁ Χριστός*, it is certain that the Sanhedrim (Luke xxii. 70, cf. 66) looked upon them as identical. There can, on the other hand, be no doubt that Jesus did not limit Himself to the theocratic idea, but rather ascribed to Himself, as the *υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ*, such attributes and such a relation to the Father, that the title, although based historically on the theocratic idea, acquired a much higher significance. This idea was perfected by our Lord in His own teaching. What is commonly called the physical idea found no place in our Lord's use of the words (Luke i. 35, cf. iii. 38), but rather what is commonly regarded as the metaphysical.

Strauss has remarked, that whilst in the Synoptists the high priest regards the idea of the Son of God as so closely bound up with that of the Messiah, that he unites the two expressions (Matt. xxvi. 63), the Jews, in St. John's Gospel, attached so much higher a meaning to the former, that they patiently bore with Jesus' claim to be the Messiah (x. 25), but took up stones to cast at Him as soon as He began to represent Himself as the Son of God. In His defence, however, our Lord seems to ignore the theocratic, and merely to notice the metaphysical signification. But in the latter respect the matter, in fact, stands differently. A difference exists to this extent only, that, according to the incidents and speeches selected by the fourth evangelist, Jesus was mainly concerned, even before the visit at the time of His last passover, with the people of Jerusalem, scribes, lawyers, members of the Sanhedrim, and party leaders, and therefore rarely limited Himself to popular representations, but early entered upon the leading point He had in view. Hence the opposition He here met with was on different grounds from that which He encountered (ac-

cording to the Synoptists) in dealing with the people of Galilee and Perea. These facts explain both the difference observable in His own declarations, and also the peculiar nature of the controversy in which He was engaged. If, then, amongst the circumstances specially dealt with by St. John, there occur more declarations respecting the person and work of Jesus,—and if our Lord, in the presence of (to Him) less congenial subjects, enters upon a testimony as to the higher elements of His nature,—it is not to be wondered at that He should meet with contradiction. Thus it was not merely the expression Son of God, but the sum-total of the higher attributes which He laid claim to as standing in an unique connection with the Father, which excited opposition. Thus in the passage (John x. 34–36) which has often been appealed to from the rationalistic side in order to prove that Jesus Himself pronounced against the higher idea of the *υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ*,—an opinion which has as little foundation as the remark of Strauss. For, in replying to the Jews who wished to stone Him as a blasphemer of God because He made Himself equal to God (ver. 33), our Lord objected (ver. 34) that the Old Testament law, which punished blasphemy with stoning, gave them no right to consider Him guilty of the offence, since in the Old Testament itself men “to whom the word of God came” (ver. 35) are called gods (vers. 34, 35; cf. Ps. lxxxii. 6); much less, then, could He be held to be a blasphemer against God for calling Himself merely *υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ*, as one who was consecrated by the Father and sent into the world (ver. 36). Here, therefore, Strauss alleges that Jesus ignores the theocratic, and appeals exclusively to the figurative use of the expression, in the passage where it is said to magisterial persons, Ye are gods. But Strauss’ remark is incorrect. Jesus does not certainly appeal to the expression *υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ* as it is applied in the Old Testament to a theocratic instrument, but He appeals to the theocratic use of the word *Θεός* itself, which is more to the purpose of His defence. The Jews accuse Him of making Himself God, and He had to defend Himself against this, and not for having called Himself the Son of God. The means He adopted to refute this charge were much more appropriate than would have been a mere appeal to the theocratic use of the expression *υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ* in the Old Testament. At the same time He thus intimates that He never in reality laid claim to the predicate *Θεός*, but only to the *υἱὸς τοῦ*

Θεοῦ, and that He is justified in so doing as the one whom the Father sanctified and sent into the world. But even then He appeals to a theocratic use of the words, and goes upon a theocratic idea of the Son of God. For the word *ἡγίασε* (cf. *ἐσφράγισε*, John vi. 27) points to *ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ* [John vi. 69; Luke iv. 34 (ix. 20)], the Holy One of God dedicated and anointed by Him. Compare also the similar expressions *ὁ ἅγιος παῖς σου*, Acts iv. 27, 30; *ὁ ἅγιος* in a pregnant sense, Rev. iii. 7; and also *οἱ ἅγιοι ἄνθρωποι τοῦ Θεοῦ*,¹ the prophets who spake as they were borne along and inspired by the Spirit of God (2 Pet. i. 21). In saying, therefore, that He is the one consecrated by the Father and sent into the world, He does not confine Himself exclusively to the metaphysical idea, but makes a declaration which is based on the theocratic use of the words *υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ*, which is so dealt with as to admit of being infinitely enhanced, since the relation of Him who is anointed and sent into the world is closely defined. But the statement is not based on the metaphysical idea of the eternal generation, but on the theocratic idea; and our Lord's object is merely to show that the Jews had no right to apply to Him the penal law against blasphemy.

Nor is Strauss correct in saying, that in John's Gospel it is only persons well disposed who use the expression *υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ* in its Messianic sense, whilst His enemies ignore this signification. Nor, again, can it be said of the latter, that they had regard only to the metaphysical signification. What they set themselves against was His making Himself equal with God, which they infer not from that name, but from the accompanying predicates.

From our Lord's lips, therefore, the expression certainly proceeds from the theocratic idea, but at the same time rises far above it, when, together with the designation, He applies to Himself the essential predicates of His person. This is also clear from the synoptic discourses, where He calls Himself *υἱὸς* (Matt. xi. 27), and ascribes to Himself exclusively, as the Son, adequate knowledge of the Father, and conversely to the Father of the Son; so that it is only through a revelation of the Son that the participation of others in the true knowledge is possible. Again, He says that everything is committed to Him by the Father, and the same still more expressly (Matt. xxviii. 18), where the form of baptism is instituted as well in His own name as in the Father's.

¹ There are, however, different readings here.—Tr.

In both these passages it is quite evident that He propounds a much higher idea than the theocratic,—rather the theocratic and ideal, or, as others maintain, the Davidical, combined. We see this also in Matt. xxii. 45. After the scribes of all parties had, with a more or less hostile purpose, plied Him with all sorts of questions, He rejoins with the question, “*What think ye of the Messiah? whose son is he?*” (ver. 42 ff.) They are ready with the answer, “*David’s.*” But He objects, “*How, then, does David call Him Lord?*” (Ps. cx. 1 ff.) He does not deny the truth of their answer, “*David’s son;*” but He denies that it affords an exhaustive answer to the question, whose son the Messiah is. He calls Himself not merely Son of man, but Son of God, and is the Son of David only in the sense of being at the same time the Son of God. He thereby gives to the thoughts of His questioners a much higher direction than that of the theocratic idea. They could not answer Him. He is, however, the Son as well as the Lord of David, and wished to point out to them that this was in those days exactly the right problem for their consideration. In this way He directed them to the truth, that their traditionary conception of the Messiah’s person was insufficient when compared with the utterances of Old Testament prophecy. Had they placed themselves on this standpoint, they could no longer have taken offence at the exalted statements which He made about Himself.

Remarkable amongst the synoptic declarations is another, although it touches on theocratic ground, viz. the parable of the vineyard (Matt. xxi. 37–39). Here the vineyard is the theocracy, and the husbandmen are the chiefs of the theocratic people. The Lord of the vineyard sent His servants the prophets from time to time to receive the fruits of the vineyard. The husbandmen refused, wishing to keep the produce for themselves; and, managing the vineyard for their own profit, allowed the people to derive only temporal advantage from it, depriving them altogether of those spiritual fruits which the Lord of the vineyard had in view. Thereupon the Lord sent unto them His Son, saying, They will reverence Him. But the husbandmen, seeing the Son, said, This is the heir; let us kill him and seize on his inheritance (ver. 38). This they did to their own destruction; so that the stone they had rejected was marvellously made, by the Lord Himself, the cornerstone of the new building of the kingdom of God. Here, although He is the heir, He far exceeds the merely theocratic idea of heir-

ship, and is raised to such a height, that there is evidently no longer a merely quantitative, but also a qualitative, difference between servant and Son.

But we see, in the attributes He claims and the declarations which He makes of Himself, in what way the teaching of Jesus, as to His person, overstepped the bounds of the theocratic idea of God's Son. This remark refers chiefly, but not exclusively, to the doctrinal discourses of St. John's Gospel. We have here to notice the declarations made by Jesus as to the nature of His being and ministry, and at the same time to bear in mind that what He here says is the expression of His inmost self-consciousness, and a direct testimony to Himself.

As to the *nature of His being*, He declares, in the first place (John v. 26), that He possesses in Himself the divine fulness of life, imparted, indeed, by the Father, but yet proper to Himself [cf. vi. 53 (1 John iii. 15, v. 10); Matt. xiii. 21]. This expression, although it does not exclude the fact of communication by the Father, yet points to the fact of the divine fulness of life having become His own. In virtue of this, He claims for Himself the power of working, so to speak, in an outward direction (cf. John v. 21), imparting true life, both spiritual and corporeal, and raising men from death to everlasting life through the spiritual quickening and glorification of the bodily life in the future resurrection (vers. 28, 29). This life is not anything external to the proper life of the Son and distinct from His being, but it is one with Him, just as the $\zeta\omega\acute{\eta}$ of the Father [ver. 26, (cf. 1 John v. 20; John i. 3)]; it is the vital force by means of which He both exists and works. Now the world, too, derives its life from God; but Jesus, in ascribing to Himself such fulness of life as can impart everlasting life to mankind, undoubtedly claims divine life of a kind which belongs to no earthly being. In virtue of this it is that He ascribes to Himself not merely a temporal and earthly existence, but also a divine and heavenly being, on which the former is based. Thus, for example, in John iii. 13 (vi. 46). Although He has entered upon and is engaged in an earthly existence, yet, by reason of His origin from above, He still has an existence with and in God, which is plainly pointed out as an enduring one by the word $\acute{\omega}\nu$ as distinct from $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\beta\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ (cf. viii. 58). This higher and lasting existence on which His earthly life is based, distinguishes our Lord as being

one with the Father [John x. 30, cf. 31-33 (xvii. 22)], as in the words, "I and the Father are one," which made the Jews again attempt to stone Him, considering it a blasphemy, because He *ἄνθρωπος ὢν* made Himself God. He made the declaration in order to establish what went before, that He would give eternal life to the sheep which heard His voice and followed Him, and in such sort that they should never be lost, and that no man could take them out of His hand, because the Father, who gave them to Him, was greater than He; but yet that, being one with the Father, the Father's almighty power was also His. A moral unity with the Father might here first suggest itself, since this would suffice to convince Him that, as the Almighty God was in His favour, His sheep could not be snatched away. But He apprehends this presupposed moral unity with the Father in so pregnant a sense, that He ascribes to Himself (as we shall see later) an absolute oneness of being with Him, and therein also a sinless will; whence the idea of moral rises into that of essential unity. And, besides this, if we put together the facts that He said "I give them life," and then appealed to the Father's almighty power, declaring, in proof of the first statement, "I and my Father are one," it seems clear that the unity spoken of is one of energy, and of divine, life-giving power. He also prays (John xvii.) not merely for a moral, but for an inner and essential unity of believers with Himself; and even in that case the unity of His being with the Father supplied the groundwork for the moral community of faith built upon it. Thus, in general, He indicates His higher being as an essential unity of life with the Father in such a way that there is a reciprocation of being between them, an existence on His part in the Father, and on the Father's in Him (x. 38, xiv. 10, 11, cf. xiv. 20, xvii. 21-23), in which, however, the Father and Son remain distinguishable. There is no merging of the Father in the Son, or *vice versâ*. He is still in the Father. Each, therefore, exists by Himself, but exists in inseparable unity with the other. And therefore it is that the Lord says also that He is never alone, but the Father is always with Him (viii. 29, xvi. 32),—that is, the life and power of the Father which manifests itself in and through Him.

Hence He maintains sometimes that there is a community of possession between His person and the Father, and sometimes that the Father is seen in Him. Both result naturally from

what had preceded, but are also declared by the Lord. The first is contained in the statement, that all which the Father has is His, and what He has is the Father's (John xvii. 10, cf. 7 and xvi. 15),—a statement, the fundamental idea of which had already been ascribed to the Lord in the synoptical discourses, where He says that all things are committed to Him by the Father (Matt. xi. 27, xxviii. 18; cf. John xiii. 3, iii. 35). It is not possible, indeed, for the Father to suffer loss in His divine being by imparting it to the Son. He still retains it; and this leads back to the same thought with which we started, viz. that the Father imparted of His own original divine life, and verily gave it to the Son to have life in Himself (John v. 26); the result of which must be added, that in Him, the Son, the Father is made manifest (John xiv. 7–9). To the surprising request of Philip, "Lord, show us the Father," the Lord replies, "So long a time have I been with you, and yet you know me not! He who has seen me has seen the Father [cf. viii. 19 (55)]. If you knew me, you would know the Father also." If Jesus is so one with the Father, that He is in the Father and the Father also in Him, it follows necessarily that the Father is seen in Him. He is the image of the Father; but we see, from the practical inference which He Himself draws, in how essentially real a sense He intends the premises to be understood.

In the next place, Jesus attributes to Himself both a *higher origin* and an *approaching exalted glorification*. The *higher origin* is designated under various formulæ.

With no mention of His physical birth, He ascribes to Himself this higher origin in the words (John viii. 23) ἐκ τῶν ἄνω εἰμί, from that which is above, equivalent to the negative expression "I am not of this world," and in contrast to ἐκ τῶν κάτω, which means this world. And it is not merely the higher origin which is here indicated, but also the disposition of mind corresponding to it (cf. xvii. 16). Still that origin is implied as the basis of the divinely-formed disposition, and He points to it in the word ὑπάγω (viii. 21, 22); for the "going away" refers back to His origin from which He proceeded (cf. iii. 31). He who comes from above is above all; he who comes from the earth is of the earth and speaks of the earth. This view of viii. 23 is confirmed by other utterances, such as ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐξῆλθον (viii. 42), παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς (xvi. 28, cf. 27 and xvii. 8),

or ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ (xvi. 30, xiii. 3, cf. iii. 2); in connection with which the Lord also states that the Father has sent Him (ἀποστέλλειν, John v. 38, vii. 29, xx. 21, xvii. 3, etc.; Matt. x. 40; Luke xi. 16; πέμπειν, John xiii. 20, vii. 28, v. 23, 24, etc.). To the same effect also ἐλήλυθεν ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ πατρός μου [v. 43 (vii. 29)], by order of and in the strength of the Father; and similarly ὁ καταβὰς ἐκ τ. οὐρ. (iii. 13, vi. 58, 33, and 50); and these expressions are all the more significant, since our Lord sometimes adds to them that He, as being sent by the Father, returns to Him again (John xiii. 3, xvi. 28). From a rationalistic point of view, indeed, some have understood, in a lower sense, the passages which speak of Jesus being sent by the Father as containing only the idea of a special vocation by providence. But this interpretation can appear possible only to those who take a superficial view, and consider these passages apart from the other high attributes which the Lord ascribes to Himself; although even thus so low a view does not accord with the expressions themselves. All men have a vocation pointed out by God; and thus every one may be said to be sent, and proceed from God, and to be destined to return to Him. Had our Lord meant to say this, He could not have described it as a special superiority, or founded thereon a claim for man's belief in Him, etc. His proceeding from the Father and coming into the world must therefore be understood in its higher sense, indeed, as pointing to a previous pre-existent life which He had independently of His earthly state of being, and with which He entered upon the natural conditions of His life on earth. In connection with the second point, He also ascribes to Himself an approaching glorified existence with the Father, which answers exactly to the peculiar divine being and nature residing in Him (John xvii. 5, 24). In His prayer, the Lord desires His glorification with the Father as something based upon His pre-existent glory (ver. 5), and on His calling as the Redeemer conferred upon Him by the Father (vers. 2, 24); also, "Again I leave the world and go to the Father" (xvi. 28). In the Synoptists also we meet with (Matt. xxiv. 30, xxv. 31 ff., xxvi. 64, etc.) intimations of His *return* to heaven, which presuppose the previous exaltation of His person. Moreover, the divine presence of the glorified Christ amongst His own people is spoken of as "where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them" (Matt. xxviii. 20, cf. xviii. 20).

These words receive a pregnant signification by comparing the rabbinical saying (to which Schleiermacher¹ has drawn attention), that if one or a few are considering the law, there is the Shechinah near, and the divine presence is with them. Thus, then, the Lord ascribes to Himself a divine being which lies at the foundation of His earthly conditioned existence, and, in harmony with this, claims for Himself, although appearing on the earth, some higher origin, proceeding not from earthly humanity, but from the heavenly Father; and to this He adds an approaching state of divine glorification.

Having been thus led on to the teaching of Jesus as to His *existence before the world was*, we proceed to consider more closely the utterances bearing upon it. In John xvii. 5, 24, He speaks of the glory which He, as the object of the Father's absolute love from everlasting, had with Him before the world was. Now, as such a state of existence is not included in the scheme of the world, its foundation cannot rest upon any creative act of God, but presupposes another mode of imparting divine life, no other than that by which the Father gave it to Him in order that He might have it in Himself (John v. 26). This we must admit as soon as we comprehend His pre-existence as a real existence before the world was, as we are authorized, nay, obliged to do in considering the declarations of our Lord which refer to it (John vi. 62, viii. 58). Some would indeed understand in all these passages nothing but an ideal pre-existence in God's predetermination; but without a forced interpretation this is impossible as regards xvii. 5, 24, viii. 58, and is quite out of the question in vi. 62. If the expression (xvii. 5), "Glorify me with the glory which I had with Thee before the world was," suggests a real possession of divine glory before the existence of the world, rather than its ideal in the predetermination and eternal counsel of God, still more stringent are the words (ver. 24), "I will that they also whom Thou hast given me may be with me where I am, that they may behold my glory which Thou hast given me, for Thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world." To refer this love of the Father to a merely foreordained love, which was only to be realized in the future, is indeed a very far-fetched interpretation; for in this sense every Christian is an object of the divine

¹ On the Godhead of Christ according to the synoptic evangelists, *Stud. and Krit.* 1829, ii.

everlasting love (cf. Eph. i. 4; 2 Tim. i. 9). So also John viii. 58, where the Lord solemnly declares, "Before Abraham was, I am,"—ἐγὼ εἰμί, not ἦν, because to Him His being was not past, but ever present. This answer is of great force against the objection of the Jews, who represented it as something absurd that He had seen Abraham or Abraham Him, if He speaks (ver. 58) of a *real* existence, saying, "My being extends beyond Abraham." Whereas the reply would have been very feeble if He had only meant, Before Abraham was, I was destined to be: I had an existence in the predetermination of God; or, in other words, the divine counsel to send the Messiah is older than Abraham. The Jews, at any rate, did not so understand it, seeing that they wished to stone the Lord on the charge of blasphemy (ver. 59). Still more decisive, however, is vi. 62, where, upon the astonishment of the Jews at His declaring it necessary for a man to eat His flesh and drink His blood in order to have life in Him, the Lord says, "Doth this offend you? What, and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where He was before?" As much as to say, "Will you not find this statement also offensive?" Here He appeals for what He had said and for its sober truth to His approaching departure to His Father (cf. iii. 13), or, as in His parting discourse, to the fact that, as He proceeded from the Father and came into the world, so also He would leave the world and return to His Father. But as the ἀναβαλεῖν denotes something real, so also must the ὅπου ἦν τὸ πρότερον be manifestly a reality.

The objections against this interpretation do not pretend to prove anything; and if it be established for vi. 62 and viii. 58, we are surely justified in it as regards ch. xvii. Upon this it has been said that the δόξα (ver. 5) is evidently identical with the δοξάζειν of ver. 1, and that the idea is defined by the corresponding one of the glorification of the Father, according to which it could refer only to glorification through the spread of His teaching. But yet the train of thought from vers. 1 to 5 shows us that the Son becomes glorious in a different way from the Father. The latter consists in a true acknowledgment of the Father, whereas in the former case the glorification of the Son's person is *with Him* (παρὰ σεαυτῷ). Compare also vers. 1 and 24, where the Lord appeals to His having possessed the glory before *with the Father*; and the completion of His work on earth by the mission of the Para-

plete is made dependent on His glorification with the Father (xvi. 5, 7, 14 ff.), being, in fact, the effect of the latter.

Again, it is said that the *δόξα* of ver. 5 is the same as that of ver. 22; but in ver. 22 a real imparting of life is the matter in question (xvii. 3, vi. 47, xi. 26), though it is one gradually realized (cf. vers. 20-23), and not yet complete. He might therefore speak of a perfect communication of the *δόξα*, if He had in view the living unity of believers in the midst of the world, based upon fellowship with Him; but yet this imparting of life must be regarded as a future participation in that *δόξα* (ver. 24) of His, into which He will again fully enter. And hereby that which He has and is abides in its original and essential independence, whilst in the case of others it is communicated to them, and is received from and dependent on Him.

Furthermore, Schleiermacher has raised an objection on the comparison of John xvii. 5 and v. 19, 20, to the effect that the Lord's sayings are not of such a nature as to nullify the fact of His human existence; so that Jesus should have had in His temporal consciousness the remembrance of a separate divine existence indwelling in Him before He became man. But the passage (v. 19, 20) which maintains a dependence of the action of the Son upon the Father is in no way opposed to the admission of a pre-existent personality, which by no means does away with that dependence; and the contrary position is the more untenable, in proportion as we take the terms *showing* and *seeing* there employed in the real sense which they require. There are, however, some dogmatic difficulties which Schleiermacher considers to stand in the way of the interpretation which asserts a real pre-existence. But this is because he does not distinguish between our Lord's *remembrance* and *knowledge* of His separate divine existence, and therefore sees in the remembrance of it the annihilation of the temporal consciousness. Now, although we too might be unable to assume any such *remembrance* on the part of Him who had become man, yet we can very well imagine a *knowledge of His pre-existence* imparted to Him in that knowledge of the Father of which He is the sole possessor (Matt. xi. 27), and together with which a knowledge of the eternal being of the Son is also imparted. The same thing is shown also in those utterances of Jesus which refer to His action, as well as in those which relate to the nature of His being. All flows from the

one fundamental idea on which we have proceeded. Both points are coincident: the nature of His being determines that of His action, and the latter presupposes the former.

The general character of His course of action is therein pronounced to be divine, partly by its nature and partly by its effect, without, however, the human element being in consequence excluded.

The first point is stated in our Lord's declaration, that as the Father works, so also doth the Son; that what the Father does, the Son also does in like manner; and hence, that the latter does nothing of Himself, apart, that is, from God, and consequently nothing in a merely human way, but only what is shown and imparted to Him by the Father (John v. 17, 19, 20, cf. 21-30; viii. 28). Here also the fifth chapter, on which so much has been already said in the former section, again comes under consideration. The Lord healed on the Sabbath, and thereby incurred persecution from the Jews (ver. 16). He defends Himself by referring to what God Himself does, and uses the words (ver. 17), "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work." The Jews were displeased at this, on the ground of His calling God in a peculiar sense His Father, and thus making Himself equal with God; whereupon the Lord entered more fully into the subject of His relation to the Father, and chiefly as regarded His ministry (ver. 19 ff.). The Son can do nothing of Himself; but what He sees the Father do, that He does in a similar manner. The Father in His love to the Son shows Him all that He Himself does, and enables Him to do the same (vers. 20, 22); and then follows the reason, viz. that He has given to the Son to have life in Himself. The whole action of the Son is thus exactly like that of the Father, and conferred by Him upon the Son, but in such wise that the Son is not merely the vehicle of the Father's action, but possesses pre-eminently the fulness of divine life in Himself; and so far His action is spontaneous,—only it is in perfect union with the Father, and in virtue of the transmission of life from Him to the Son, and of the perfect unity of the Son's life with Him. Thus we see, both that the action of the Son is His own and the words He speaks His own, and yet that the doctrine is the Father's, and that the works which He does, He does not of Himself. And so the Father speaks and acts in Him, but yet so that He is still a free agent, and not merely a dependent medium of communication.

As regards the operation of His ministry, it is declared by the Lord to be divine, in that it possessed a life-giving and judging power. Man, as a creature, is unable either to give life or exercise judgment. Both are divine works ; and it is the entrance of the divine life, light, strength, and truth into the world which is able to effect them. The life which enters is negative in relation to the world and sin, and consequently separates sin and the sinner from what belongs to God, that is, from divine purity and holiness : light and darkness are divided. On the other hand, life is also given in a positive sense, and is to be understood as partly spiritual, partly corporeal, involving as it does the glorification of believers in both ways. We see both sides of the subject in John v. 21-30. The Father has handed over all judgment to the Son (vers. 22, 27), and with it also the power of quickening whom He will (vers. 21, 25, 28, 29). The positive action, that of giving life (cf. vi. 40 ff.), is very often mentioned or discussed by St. John. But that the human side of this action is not lost sight of, appears not only from the fact that the Lord generally represents Himself as man and Son of man, but from His pointing Himself out (v. 27) as the Son of man, and expressly saying that the Father committed the power of judgment to Him because He is the Son of man. To this He adds (ch. vi.), that He is the One come down from heaven, who in that very capacity gives life to the world, and especially in so far as He bestows His flesh and blood for that purpose. The fuller exegesis of this passage belongs to the doctrine of redemption ; but the observation finds place here, that the characteristic action of the Son, in which He stands so entirely and without parallel alone, is conditional upon the union of the Son of God and Son of man. The end for which He came down from heaven was to give life unto the world ; and He executes judgment expressly because He is become the Son of man ; and the words and works to which He appeals are those of Him who has thus been made man.

Let us now, in accordance with the general characteristic of His ministry, look at the different branches of it, one of which He speaks of as belonging to His earthly life, and the other as kept in reserve till the time of His glorification. To the first belongs the department of His knowledge and teaching. He often speaks of His teaching, and goes a step further back to His knowledge of what He taught. The purport of His teaching was, as He

said, to manifest the name of the Father (John xvii. 6), the knowledge of whom He points out as belonging exclusively to Himself: No man knoweth the Father, save the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal Him (Matt. xi. 27; Luke x. 22). At the same time He adds, that no man has ever seen the Father (John vi. 46) except Himself, who is from the Father: this agrees with the declaration in Matthew. No man besides Himself has adequate knowledge of the Father, that is, the perfect knowledge which is peculiarly His own. But as He knows the Father, so He knows the world also; except that there is no expression as yet of a knowledge embracing all details of the temporal development. Still, it is easily seen that in the gospels a peculiarly far-reaching knowledge in this direction also is ascribed to Him; and narratives showing this are given, especially by St. John, with special reference to His penetrating insight into the character of the men with whom He has to do. Thus He did not confide in those (John ii. 24, 25) who first had a growing faith in Him, because He knew them all, and needed not that any one should testify to Him of man, for He knew what was in man: of which we have an example in His conversation with Nicodemus. Still more remarkable is His statement (Mark xiii. 32) that no man knew the day and hour of His future coming, not even the angels in heaven, yea, not even the Son of man, but the Father only. He is here speaking in the humiliation of His earthly life, and the words refer exclusively to the exact time, not to the fact as such, but to something which regards the details of temporal development which depend upon the free play of moral personal agencies as a factor of the history.

In strict accordance with this testimony to the knowledge of Jesus is the witness He bears to the teaching side of His action. He does not speak or teach anything merely of Himself, but as an emanation from the power and will of the Father, which are also His (John v. 30, viii. 28, xiv. 10, xii. 49, xvii. 16-18, xvii. 8). We are, therefore, required to accept His utterances as divine (viii. 47 (43), xvii. 7, 8, xiv. 24, xii. 48-50); and, in particular, we must believe Him as the One who is from the Father, and has seen the Father, in matters which far transcend the limits of human experience (vi. 46 (62), iii. 13). Whoever, therefore, refuses to believe Him, rejects the Father's word and authority (Luke x. 16; John xiv. 24), and is thereby already judged

(John xii. 48, 49, v. 38, 42-44, viii. 41 ff.); and, on the other hand, the believer believes not Him but the Father (xii. 44, v. 24, xiii. 20). And he who is resolved to do the will of His heavenly Father will come to the knowledge of His teaching, whether it be of God or propounded merely on His own authority (John vii. 17, cf. viii. 42). He also speaks in the same way of His

Messianic deeds under the title *ἔργα* as distinct from teaching (*λόγος*), among which deeds the working of miracles is especially included; which, He says, are works of the Father (John x. 37, 38). In His works, as works of the Father, they must and will know that the Father is in Him and He in the Father, and consequently that there subsists a reciprocal unity of life between them, since the Father speaks and acts through Him (John xiv. 10, 11, v. 19, 20). In the last passage, also, the works are named, in the sense of His Messianic action, as the giving of life by means of His Sonship and of His having come down from heaven. He is the heavenly bread which gives life to the world, imparting life through His working, but with a reference here also to His person. Similarly, in the Synoptists, the Lord speaks of His miracles as belonging to His Messianic working, pointing to them, in connection with His message of salvation to the poor who need redemption, as the sign that He and no other is the expected One referred to in prophecy (Matt. xi. 3-5). Besides this, He declares expressly that He performs these works in the strength of God (Matt. xii. 28), with immediate reference to the casting out of devils, saying, "If I by the Spirit of God cast out devils, the kingdom of God is come unto you;" that is to say, is already a really present existence,—the victorious power of God ruling in your midst, and hence the kingdom of God itself. In the parallel place of Luke (xi. 20) we have the addition *ἐν δακτύλῳ Θεοῦ*, with the power, the finger of God. His deeds are the operations of divine power. In harmony also with the foregoing is what Jesus declares as to His

Moral conduct. He is not only conscious that no man can charge Him with sin (John viii. 46), but also that He does at all times what is pleasing to the Father who sent Him; and that, consequently, the Father never leaves Him alone without the support of His quickening presence and companionship, but is always with Him (ver. 29). Hence His actions are always in accordance with the Father's will, and are done in the Father's power.

Hence also His consciousness of His continual and uninterrupted agreement with the Father's will, and of the Father's constant approbation of His actions, which results partly from His confidence (ver. 46) that no man can convince Him of sin, and partly from His consciousness, which He expresses in the words (iv. 34), "My meat is to do the will of Him that sent me, and to finish His work." This was when, on the return of the disciples with provisions from the Samaritan town, He had said, "I have meat to eat that ye know not of," meaning that He had an inner spiritual nourishment, which consisted in doing the divine will, and performing the work committed to Him by the Father. The moral character of His course of action is that which supplies this inner nourishment and brings with it, as the fulfilment of the divine will and the conscious expression of the uninterrupted harmony subsisting between Himself and the Father, the quickening force of inward satisfaction and contentment. The simple expression of this inner contentment, in the retrospect of His work on earth then drawing to a close, is found in the high-priestly prayer of John xvii. 4-6. In the synoptic accounts, it is of the greatest importance to observe, in the general representation of His life, the consciousness which He everywhere shows of His unity with the divine will, and also, in particular, the declaration in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. v. 17-20), that He was come not to destroy the law and the prophets, but to fulfil; understanding thereby not merely teaching but doing in a practical sense; for He who (ver. 19) *fulfils* and teaches the commandment shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven. And as in this discourse He claims to be not merely a member of the heavenly kingdom, but also the Lord of it, for whose sake the members must be willing to suffer (ver. 11), we see how absolutely and completely He understands the task He imposes on Himself of fulfilling the law and the prophets. Hence His displeasure when the rich young man (Matt. xix.) addresses Him as Good Master, seeking nothing in Him but a good Teacher: "Why callest thou me good? no man is good but God alone." Not that He found fault with the application of the word *good* to Himself, but with the supposition that, taking Him for a man, the speaker applied the term to Him in a pretentious manner, in the sense of pharisaical righteousness. And so He points out in what follows that a man can no more enter into the kingdom of heaven by his own strength than a

camel can go through the eye of a needle, but that what is impossible with men is possible with God.

It is remarkable, also, that our Lord speaks of His death as an essential part of His ministry on earth, and with such particulars as point decisively to the higher position of His whole person. He puts His death in connection with His resurrection, both in the general announcement by the Synoptists and John of His suffering and death, and still more expressly where He teaches (John x. 17, 18) that He has power to lay down His life and power to take it again, seeing that death for Him is no necessity of nature, both because He is the holy and sinless One, who must needs be free from both sin and death, and also because He possesses divine eternal life in Himself. The Father loves Him for the very fact that He lays down His life,—a purpose which proceeds from His spontaneous love to God and man. His death, therefore, is an offer of quickening spiritual food, a sacrifice of Himself to God for His people, that they also may be sanctified in the truth (John xvii. 19), a death for the forgiveness of sins (cf. Matt. xx. 28; John iii. 14, cf. 15). These are all passages which will demand our attention in treating of the doctrine of redemption, but which are noticed here because they show how the higher idea of His personality enters also into the declarations concerning His death. To the same effect is what the Lord says of His action in His exalted and glorified state, wherein He promises to make His dwelling, in the unity of the Father, with believers (John xiv. 23, cf. 21), and to grant them the blessed aid of His perpetual presence (Matt. xxviii. 20, xviii. 20). Further, He attributes to Himself the sending of the Holy Ghost for the comfort of believers, the communication of the Spirit, the granting of His people's prayers (John xiv. 13, 14), the awakening of the dead (John v. 21, 24 ff., vi. 39, 54), and lastly the judgment (John v. 22, 27, cf. 30; Matt. xxv. 31 ff., cf. xxiv. 30, 31). Thus the ministry of Jesus is entirely superhuman, although in a human form, proceeding from the divine fulness of life residing in Him, both when ascribed to Him in His low estate, and much more when spoken of as belonging to His state of approaching divine glorification. It is, moreover, an action which includes the victory over sin, whether regarded in its power of judging or of imparting life. In proportion, then, as He asserts this of Himself, and points out sin as universal amongst mankind, the more does

He raise Himself above the level of the world, not being at all implicated in the entanglement of sin, but, on the contrary, vanquishing it partly by judging and partly by forgiving, and bringing about its destruction by destroying the death which it entails. The course of His ministry is briefly indicated in this contrast with, and victory over sin, by which His person is characterized as absolutely exalted above mankind. This character is given to it in virtue of the higher existence which Jesus attributes to Himself, and on which His temporal life is based.

What idea, then, of the person of Jesus, considered on its higher side, do we gain from the representation of it up to this point? That, on the one hand, as appearing on earth in temporal life, He was man, who, as His history shows, fulfilled the whole measure of human destiny from birth even to the grave; on the other, He was a divine Being who had appeared in a human form, in whom the divine fulness of life dwelt, being imparted to Him as the Son, and therefore distinguishable from the divine nature, the Father who imparted it, so that it formed in Jesus personally a centre of life, and was further communicated from Him to others. And as He is the medium through which this divine action receives its outward direction, He is also the object of divine love, the one in whom God is well pleased; and this, indeed, in His pre-existence also, without regard to His temporal manifestation in the world.

But now comes the question, in what light, according to His own utterances, we have to regard His person before He came into the world? The leading topic of His discourses is the One who has appeared; and when He calls Himself the Son of God, it only applies to the whole person of the manifested One. The pre-existent personality is never called *Son*, nor does He ever expressly separate the two sides of His being, in order to limit a certain predicate to one. Hence in some discourses He ascribes to Himself certain high attributes which include glorification. But His utterances as to His pre-existence can be naturally explained only on the hypothesis that He attributes to Himself a personal existence before the world was, distinguishable from the Father's personality (John xvii. 5); for He has been glorified with the Father, and has been the object of His love (ver. 24), but still in the same identity of nature with Him as subsequently existed in the manifested Christ. This pre-existent personality is the centre of divine life, whence,

from the very first, it was communicated to the world, and whence, under the Old Testament dispensation, a principle of beneficial agency was diffused over mankind (John viii. 56-58). It contained in itself also the power of becoming man, or, as He Himself says (John xvi. 28), of coming into the world.

This idea of the actual pre-existence, flowing as their only natural interpretation from His own utterances, is perfectly consistent with what the apostles, John as well as Paul, have deduced from His teaching.

John, where he speaks in his own name, and is not merely transmitting an historical account of our Lord's sayings, enters into the subject of His existence previous to His earthly manifestation. In the first epistle (i. 2) he points Him out as the eternal life which was with the Father from the beginning, and in process of time appeared to men, beginning with the apostles. This leads us back to John v. 26. But still more striking is the prologue of the gospel. Jesus Christ (John i. 17), who was made flesh (ver. 14), and is the source of grace and truth to mankind, is the Word who was in the beginning with God, who Himself was God, yet in a distinct personality. He is the Word through whom are all things, and in whom the principle of life for the world and mankind is contained (vers. 3, 4). He it is through whom all divine light and life come to the world and mankind; but this fulness of light and life is in Him personally, and indeed from the beginning. He it is, then, through whom, under the Old Testament dispensation, the powers of light and life were conveyed to mankind (vers. 9, 10); through whom, as made flesh (ver. 14), God reveals Himself as full of grace and truth; who is therefore, as He Himself says (xiv. 6), the truth and the life, the resurrection and the life. It appears from this that St. John understood our Lord's sayings throughout as referring to a real pre-existence.

The manner in which St. Paul closely defined the idea of the person of the Son of God corresponds to this. He is defined as the one who has been made manifest, *σὰρξ γενόμενος, κατὰ σάρκα*, and therein as the Son of God by virtue of the *πνεῦμα ἁγιοσύνης* which resides in Him as the *σὰρξ*. Then, too, the Lord Himself is the Spirit (2 Cor. iii. 17); and Christ is not of the earth, like the first man, but is the Lord from heaven (1 Cor. xv. 47), and therefore of a heavenly nature (ver. 48), essentially raised above the first created man, and intended as a second

archetype (so to speak) of human nature. And this Lord from heaven is the image of the invisible God (2 Cor. iv. 4), the first-born of every creature (Col. i. 15; Heb. i. 2 ff.), in the sense that in Him, and to Him, and for Him all things are created and continue. In Him dwells all the fulness of the Godhead in bodily impress (Col. ii. 9); and thus, too, He is, moreover, the first-born from the dead (1 Cor. xv. 20). Now this more fully evolved apostolic doctrine is no more than the development of our Lord's own sayings,—the idea of the image of God, for example, being plainly contained in those recorded by St. John. And the apostles' teaching can be fully understood only if that of Jesus Himself is presupposed. The Son, in His higher nature, is accordingly like the Father and in unity with Him. The sum-total, therefore, of the impressions made upon the apostles' minds by their intercourse with Jesus, which they carried with them into their vocation, is no other than that in virtue of which they worship Him as the Lord, bow the knee before Him, and call upon His name (Rom. x. 13, cf. 12 and 9). In considering this, we shall find no difficulty in passages where Jesus undoubtedly subordinates Himself to the Father, first by calling Himself the Son, and pointing out that all things are committed to Him by the Father; then by praying to the Father, and even stating expressly, "My Father is greater than I" (John xiv. 28). For all these are the declarations of Him who became man, and came into the world; who is not only the Son of God, but in the unity of the same person both Son of God and Son of man. He is the express image of the Father, as St. Paul says most distinctly, and the Epistle to the Hebrews (i. 3) emphatically asserts. This is the view maintained throughout the New Testament. The facts of communication and unity of being are co-existent: the idea of communication does not constitute a separate being.

We have so far proceeded on the two ideas, Son of man and Son of God. By His own statements in John and the Synoptists, Jesus is both these in one personality: both are so intimately bound together, that the one idea presupposes and furthers the other. In this one personality He has flesh and blood, and a *perfect corporal nature*, as is shown by the passages which treat of His death and of the Lord's Supper (Matt. xxvi. 26, 28; Mark xiv. 22 f.; Luke xxii. 19, 20). But He has also a *soul* ($\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$) which He gives up at His death (Matt. xx. 28;

John x. 15, 17, [xv. 13]), of which soul He speaks without reference to the dissolution of His earthly life (John xii. 27). From this we see how erroneous the view is which has been maintained in modern times, that in John the λόγος stands in place of the human soul; for if He became σὰρξ, the idea of the ψυχή is included; hence the complete spiritual life subject to a tripartite division (1 Thess. v. 23). He ascribes to Himself a *heart* (Matt. xi. 29) as the centre of His personality, or of His humility, as the fundamental feeling of His moral life, and seated in its inmost recesses. At His death He commends His spirit into the Father's hands, which proves that in Him the spirit is united with flesh and blood; yet this organic connection is everywhere brought about by means of a ψυχή.

We have hitherto combined the utterances of Jesus without reference to the different narratives in which they occur. Now comes the question whether those of the Synoptists do not in fact appear so different in kind from those of John as to require to be dealt with separately. There can be no doubt that most of the sayings of Jesus about His person in general, and especially of those which predicate of it the highest attributes, and on which, consequently, the high conception of it is based, belong to St. John's Gospel.

What the Synoptists transmit to us of the discourses of Jesus is both less pregnant and more limited in extent, and there are but few passages in comparison with those recorded by St. John; but yet everything essential contained in the more copious record is either comprised, or by implication vouched for. In the Synoptists, too, Jesus speaks *of being sent by God* (Matt. x. 40; Luke ix. 48; Mark ix. 37), and also, indeed, of some peculiar pre-eminence in His person, which makes it impossible to apply the expression in nothing but the lower sense (*vide supra*). Our Lord asserts, moreover, that He does His *miracles in the power of God* (Matt. xii. 28; Luke xi. 20), driving out the devil because He is the stronger (Luke xi. 22; Matt. xii. 29; Mark iii. 27), and for a proof that the kingdom of God is already come in and with Him. He maintains that it is He alone who possesses an *adequate knowledge of God* (Luke x. 22), and that to Him everything is delivered by the Father (Matt. xi. 27; Luke x. 22), even *all power* in heaven and earth (Matt. xxviii. 18); that He is *effectually present with His people*, even to the end of the world (ver. 20), as the Shechinah (*vide supra*) (xviii. 20). Again, He will send to His

disciples the power *from on high*, promised of the Father (Luke xxiv. 49; [Acts i. 4, 5]), that they may be baptized with the Holy Ghost,—an operation which the Baptist (in St. John's Gospel also) referred to Christ. Furthermore, the Lord declares that He will at the right moment endue His disciples with power and wisdom to answer for themselves. And this brings us to the same point, since it is precisely the Spirit of the Father who will speak in and through them (Luke xxi. 14, 15; Matt. x. 19, 20; Mark xiii. 11). To Him, again, is judgment over all men committed (cf. Matt. xxv. 31, xxiv. 30 seq., and xvi. 27, vii. 21–23); He will be *raised to the right hand of the majesty of God* in heaven (Matt. xxvi. 64), and will come again (Matt. xxiv. 29–31, 37, 39); the angels are *His*, and *subject* to Him (Matt. xiii. 41, cf. 49, xvi. 27, xxv. 31, cf. Eph. i. 21, 22). He regards Himself on earth as the One who fulfils the law and the prophets, and who *forgives sins* in the name of the Father, so as to be able to do away with the consequences of sin (Matt. ix. 4–7), and as the One who sheds His blood for its forgiveness (Matt. xxvi. 28). He also claims to be the One who *imparts the Spirit*, *exercises judgment*, and, having all power in heaven and earth given unto Him, perfects His kingdom in glory.

Strauss is so far right in acknowledging (i. 483) that the Synoptists also ascribe to Jesus, both for the present and future, the highest human dignity, and also the most exalted relation to the Godhead. But he does not go far enough; for what Jesus claims to Himself surpasses all human measure. And even in the Synoptists He is represented as the One who ransoms from sin, and fulfils the two undoubtedly divine operations of judgment and redemption. There is, indeed, this important difference, that the Synoptists record no assertions of the pre-existence; but this decides nothing, since they undoubtedly report sayings in which our Lord's unity of being with God is unmistakeably involved. We have also in the Synoptists a rich store of sayings concerning His glorification, announced as being close at hand; and these are by no means lower in character than those on the same subject recorded by St. John. The same, too, may be said as to the functions which He ascribes to Himself as the glorified One. He is declared to be the Judge of all the world, of all nations, not merely in the later discourses (Matt. xvi. 27, etc.), but even in the Sermon on the Mount (vii. 21–23). Let us

now consider what, from the point of view taken both in the Old Testament, and in the Old and New together, is involved in the idea of a judge of the moral worth of mankind, in which an absolutely infallible decision is included, referring not only to the most secret acts of commission or omission, but also to the innermost grounds of the heart. From the biblical standpoint, Christ cannot be a judge without truly divine qualities, such as omniscience, holiness, righteousness, and omnipotence to carry His sentences into effect. And how earnestly other attributes are intended, which are ascribed to Jesus in the Synoptists, may be inferred from the fact that not only everything is given over to Him, but also all *ἐξουσία* in heaven and earth is delegated to Him by the Father (Matt. xxviii. 18, cf. xi. 27; Luke x. 22), as He also says to the high priest, "Hereafter ye shall see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power," that is, as it is elsewhere expressed by the apostles, at the right hand of God (cf. also Mark xvi. 19). In this expression the first verse of Ps. cx. is applied to Christ, and that in His relation to God the Father; and consequently no less than full participation in the divine Lordship, just as in the divine action and blessedness, is ascribed to Him, with the effect that all enemies of His cause and person, who are necessarily also the enemies of God, shall be finally overcome, as is further set forth dogmatically by St. Paul (1 Cor. xv. 24-28), resting on our Lord's own assertion (Matt. xxvi. 64). It is, however, not only to His position of future glory and exaltation that these predicates apply, for it was before His exaltation that our Lord used the expressions of Matt. xxviii. 18; and even during His humiliation He spoke the words of Matt. xi. 27 (cf. Luke x. 22), wherein reference is made to His knowledge. Now this is one of the most forcible utterances of Jesus respecting His person; for although His knowledge only is mentioned, yet whatever applies to it is applicable also to the capability and action of His whole life and personality, to which His knowledge must of necessity be conformable. In this passage He sets forth the unity in knowledge subsisting between Himself and the Father, saying expressly that no one but Himself knows the Father, and no one knows the Son save the Father; therefore His relation to the Father is here said to be of that kind which results in perfect unity of knowledge. We must not, therefore, be surprised at our Lord in one place grouping Himself, as the Son, with the Father

and the Spirit, in order to declare that the apostles were to baptize in the name of all three persons (Matt. xxviii. 19), almost as if it were one *ὄνομα*. There is the less cause for wonder, when we recollect that He says in the synoptical gospels that He will bestow upon His own the Spirit, the strength from on high promised by the Father, giving power and wisdom to speak aright; and that thus they will be baptized with the Holy Ghost. All these assertions and statements of our Lord's self-testimony show, however, how untenable the position is, that in the synoptical accounts Jesus appears merely as a man endowed with the Divine Spirit. We find a peculiar harmony between the Synoptists and John's Gospel, if we compare the accounts of the trial before the Sanhedrim with that of the hostility directed against Jesus, according to John x. 31-33. Here the Jews wished to stone Him, not because He declared Himself to be the Messiah, but because He claimed to be one with the Father; and the ground of His condemnation in His trial was not merely that He claimed to be the Messiah, but that He did so in the high sense which was unusual with the Jews, which, in the high priest's opinion, involved the crime of blasphemy against God. So little, therefore, do the synoptic sayings about the person of Jesus detract from His dignity, that they lead to nothing less than the essential unity in life, knowledge, and power which He has with the Father, being at the same time made very man. The sayings about His pre-existence recorded by John add a retrospective glance at Jesus yet unmanifested, as He existed before the foundation of the world, distinct from the Father, yet one with Him.

But this rich and profound line of teaching is entered upon in the Old Testament; for a study of the latter shows that it contains certain expressions which refer to the Messiah as the Son of God, and lead further, even in those early days, than to the mere historico-theocratic idea of the Messianic King. And this explains how the whole apostolic view could so readily accept the testimony borne by Jesus to His higher nature, and how it became at once the common property of the evangelical accounts.

In all the passages of the Old Testament which bear upon the subject, the most important point to be observed is how the Messiah is represented as the divine instrument to all; that in and through Him the very covenant-God Jehovah reveals Himself and works for the good of men. Hence we at least see that

the Messiah must be an instrument which in no way intercepts or obscures the effectual operation of God, but acts as His most perfect medium of communication. And this is the conception of the Messiah on which the view taken of Him in the New Testament is based, wherein He is represented to be of a like nature with God the Father, and as possessing unity of life and being with Him as His most perfect counterpart. This general notion becomes more defined in the New Testament, and is expressed in complete fulness.

The view on which the synoptical selection of the sayings of Jesus is based, might attain its result even apart from the definite doctrine of the pre-existence, simply by means of its connection with the Old Testament. God Himself appears in the Messiah, who is so far the *κύριος*. He is thus represented historically chiefly by Matthew and Luke. They begin with the supernatural conception. The personal life of Jesus of Nazareth does not proceed from man, not, at least, like that of all other men, but a new source of life is brought about in the almighty quickening power of God. The holy thing so born will therefore (Luke i. 35) be called the Son of God. And Jesus of Nazareth, who in this way made His entrance into the world of men, grows up increasing in wisdom with age, and in favour with God and man. At His baptism, to which He submitted in common with every other Israelite who believed in the approach of the Messianic kingdom, He was pointed out by the divine voice as the Son of God in whom the Father is well pleased, and at the same time completely endowed with the fulness of the Divine Spirit,—the last point being as clearly enunciated by St. John (i. 33), although the latter takes an entirely different starting-point in his gospel. He starts from the higher, the Synoptics from the lower, standpoint; but the person thus borne witness to as the Messiah reveals in the midst of His human lowliness His divine endowment and glory, both in His words and actions, and also in His whole personality, as a prophet mighty in deed and word before God and all people, as His apostles testified in the time of His abasement between His death and resurrection. The testimony which He bore to Himself attains a high point in Matt. xi. and John xvii.; and, after His resurrection, He declares Himself to be the One to whom all power is given in heaven and in earth, who will remain with His own unto the end, and who now sends them forth to

baptize all nations. His life on earth is a manifestation in lowliness of the Lord from heaven, until, through His suffering, death, and resurrection, He shall have revealed Himself to His people, and won recognition as the Son co-équal in being with the Father. The conclusion of St. Luke's Gospel is in effect the same. He ends with the ascension; whilst St. John represents as the culminating point in the life of Jesus His acknowledgment as his Lord and God by the most unbelieving of His disciples (John xx. 28), who is mentioned here only because he is brought to this acknowledgment later than he should have been.

§ 23. *The Glorification of the Father in the Son.*

This proposition results from the foregoing conclusions; and only on account of its importance in the conception of God, and in the teaching of Jesus in general, deserves to be separately considered. Christ Himself asserts it, chiefly in St. John's Gospel; but the synoptical utterances also bear witness to the doctrine involved in it. Those recorded by St. John express, first, a unity of being and likeness between the Father and the Son, and then a glorifying of the one through the other (xvii. 1, 5, xiii. 31 seq.). At the moment when, at the Last Supper, the traitor Judas, plainly recognised by Jesus and pointed out to his fellow-disciples, had left the company with which he was unfit to associate, the Lord says, *νῦν ἐδοξάσθη, κ.τ.λ.*, "Now is the Son of man glorified, and God is glorified in Him;" and adds, "If God be glorified in Him, God shall also glorify Him in Himself, and shall straightway glorify Him." Here there is spoken of,

A *glorification of the Son* consequent upon His sufferings, which, in His glance at the traitor now hastening to the fulfilment of his infamous purpose, He regards as an already accomplished fact. The last train of circumstances is set in motion which will uninterruptedly work out its own completion; and the Son of man will thus be glorified, and glorified by God. He is glorified, because it is the highest exertion of His moral action which confers glory upon Him, partly of itself and partly through its effects on all mankind. And herein is included the further glorification of the Son in heaven, since the Father glorifies Him in union with Himself by receiving Him into glory (xvii. 1, 5).

We have also a *glorification of the Father in the Son*. God is glorified *ἐν αὐτῷ*, not merely *through* the Son but *in* Him, that is,

in His person. In this is the Father glorified, since He has imparted the fulness of divine life to the Son in such a way that it is recognised in Him, and the Father is seen in Him. It is not merely revealed to men *through* Him or through His teaching and His deeds (xii. 45, viii. 19, xiv. 9), but *in* Him, so that He is the Father's most perfect image and organ. Similarly in ch. xvii. 1-6 both propositions are contained,—first, that the Son has glorified the Father by accomplishing the work given Him to do on earth, which has for its object the imparting of eternal life to previously carnal man (ver. 4, cf. 2), through the revelation of the name of God to men, whom the Father has delivered over and bestowed upon the Son (ver. 6); in the next place, in virtue of this glorification of the Father by the Son, the prayer of the latter asks that the Father would also glorify the Son (ver. 1), that the Father's glory may be perfected (cf. ver. 26). Hence all that is in the person of the Father and is performed in and through it by virtue of the unity of the Son's life with His, has for its end the glorification of the Father, His manifestation to the world, and the promotion of His honour therein. Although this result is not directly deducible from our Lord's own teaching, except in St. John's Gospel, yet it is confirmed in the Synoptists, especially by St. Matthew (xi. 27) and St. Luke (x. 22) (cf. John vi. 46). If the Son alone has perfect knowledge of the Father, and can communicate it to whom He will (as conversely the Father imparts true knowledge of the Son, Matt. xvi. 16), so is the Father also glorified in the Son, in whom alone He is revealed. For the revelation of Himself, as in truth the Father of Jesus Christ, as an effectual revelation which at once imparts a living knowledge to those who are thenceforth no longer carnal but spiritual, inasmuch as they belong to Christ (John xvii. 6),—such a revelation is at the same time a *glorification* of the Father, revealing Him, as it does, in His entire perfection so as to receive honour and worship from those to whom He is revealed. Thus the foregoing passage serves to testify to the credibility of the Johannean utterances of Christ. Nor, indeed, is the manifestation of the Father in the Son completed by the close of Christ's visible sojourn on earth; on the contrary, He decidedly points to His work as a continuous one (John xvii. 26); for the words, "I have declared unto them Thy name and will declare it," spoken primarily of the disciples, have a further reference to all who,

through their word, should believe on Him (ver. 20). In both series of the gospel narrative He gives intimation of His second coming, and connects with it the future completion of His work. This second coming, however, finds a nearer fulfilment in the sending of His Spirit, and the consequent indwelling of Himself and the Father in the hearts of believers (John xiv. 23, 26). After the withdrawal of His visible presence, the Spirit, as His substitute, was to glorify Him (John xvi. 14); and as in other cases, so here also the glorification of the Son would redound to the Father's honour. He points out, therefore, most decidedly that as He is the manifester and glorifier of the Father, this work is a progressive one, and will find its completion only in the future, being completed by the promised effusion of the Spirit upon His people (see below).

Thus the characteristic idea of God as Father and Spirit is again prominently brought forward. He is Father because He puts forth extraneously to Himself a life allied to His own, and thus reveals and glorifies Himself; Spirit, because His is the most perfect life, which, however, does not end in His own being, but imparts itself essentially to others. This, however, is more closely defined in the idea of the Son. But the doctrine is not yet exhausted; for the Son Himself speaks of His glorification through the Spirit, and, in asserting the glorification of the Father in Him, must needs add to His teaching the doctrine of the Holy Ghost.

§ 24. *The Spirit.*

We must have already seen, in the teaching as to the Father, that the Old Testament contained a doctrine of the Spirit of God. He is called רִיחַ יְהוָה, רִיחַ אֱלֹהִים, and in two places (Ps. li. 11, and Isa. lxiii. 10) Spirit of Holiness; and in the Apocrypha πνεῦμα ἁγίον (Wisdom i. 5, ix. 17). This Spirit of God, possessing life in Himself, is the divine principle of activity everywhere at work in the world (Ps. cxxxix. 7). At first in external nature (Gen. i. 2; Ps. civ. 30, and xxxiii. 6), as if the quickening breath of God (Gen. ii. 7; Job xxxiii. 4), as the breath of His mouth or lips (Isa. xi. 4); and then also as existing in a human person (Job xxxii. 8), as the inspiring principle of courage, resolution, and warlike deeds (Judg. xi. 29, xiii. 25; 1 Sam. xi. 6), of bodily strength (Judg. xiv. 6), and also of holy skill in art (Ex. xxxi. 3-5, xxxv. 31-35); of administrative talent in a

ruler (1 Sam. xvi. 13), of wisdom and acuteness (Job xxxii. 8; Isa. xi. 2), and of moral purity (Ps. li. 13; Isa. lxiii. 10). Especially is this Spirit the active principle in prophecy (Num. xxiv. 2, 3; 1 Sam. xix. 20-23), but even in the theocratic people working only in isolated and individual cases,—Moses himself feeling this limitation (Num. xi. 29, cf. 14, 16, 17, and 25-28); but so much the more needful was it that He should rest in superabundant fulness upon the Messiah (Isa. xi. 2, lxi. 1 [cf. Luke iv. 18]; Isa. xlii. 1 [cf. Matt. xii. 18]), and should in His times be poured out in rich measure upon all flesh (Joel iii. 1, 2), upon every age, sex, and condition (Isa. xlv. 3; Ezek. xxxvi. 26, 27, cf. xi. 19, and xxxix. 29; Zech. xii. 10). And what appears in earlier times merely as the subject of prayer and longing in an individual (Ps. li. 10), that God would create in him a new heart, and implant new strength of spirit,—a bold thought, indeed; a prayer rich in prophetic fulness, and so far in advance of the times in which he lived as to be conceivable only in a man of such deeply characteristic spirituality as David, to whom the psalm is attributed,—this becomes the very object of the Messianic promise, viz. that God will, by implanting His Spirit in them, give a new heart to those who are in membership with His people (Ezek. xxxvi. 26, 27). Here, then, the New Testament steps in, and firstly, in our Lord's own teaching and promises, completes the Old Testament doctrine of the Spirit, Jesus imprinting upon it a characteristic stamp, which is perpetuated by the teaching of the apostles. The existence of the Spirit of God in the Messiah Himself is taught also in the New Testament, but without asserting that the Holy Ghost, the Spirit of God, constituted the higher nature in Christ in the same way as He had previously worked in the world of nature and of man. Already had John the Baptist pointed Him out as the One on whom the Spirit of God rests continually (John i. 33, cf. iii. 34), in contrast to a merely temporary influence, as in the case of the prophets,—by which fact the Messiah was in a position decidedly superior to theirs. The Baptist also completes the Old Testament idea, by declaring that in the Messiah God has given His Spirit without measure (John iii. 34), and that it is He who shall baptize with the Holy Ghost (John i. 33; cf. Matt. iii. 11; Mark i. 8; Luke iii. 16). No doubt, in prophecy, too, the Spirit of God is said to rest upon the Messiah, and Isa. xi. 2 may be

interpreted to the effect that this is the case in full measure, although the latter point is rather left to be inferred. But it is nowhere said in the Old Testament that the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, which was to ensue in the Messianic times, should result immediately from the Messiah; and thus the conception of Him in the prophetic writings and in the Old Testament generally is carried to a higher point. It might appear, from this declaration of the Baptist, that he regarded the possession of the Spirit as constituting the higher element in the person of the Messiah; but we must remember that he also asserts His pre-existence (John i. 30, cf. 15), and thereby showed his complete grasp of the Messianic prophecies up to their culminating point. Thus the law of succession in prophecy extends from the Old Testament down to this last prophet, John the Baptist, the immediate forerunner of the Messiah. Like the prophets of the old dispensation, he takes up the prophetic teaching of the Old Testament at the point where it had left off, embodies it in his own testimony, and carries it forward to more complete development. We find the doctrine of the existence of the Spirit of God in the Messiah still further developed in the discourses of Jesus Himself, where, however, the peculiarity of His person is by no means made to consist in the possession of the Spirit. For when (Luke iv. 21) the Lord says that the prophecy of Isaiah (lxi. 1) is fulfilled in Him (the words being put into the mouth of the Messiah, "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me," etc.), or when (Matt. xii. 28) He says that He casts out the devil in the Spirit of God, in this possession of, and working by, the Spirit, the higher nature of Christ's person is not expressed, His utterances on this point (*vide supra*) being quite of a different character.

All the more decidedly, however, is it the teaching of Jesus that He, the Son, imparts the Spirit, and that from Him, and by means, indeed, of His glorification, the Spirit is poured out upon believers. And this brings us to the teaching of Jesus Himself concerning the Spirit.

When speaking of Him, He uses the expressions *πνεῦμα*, or *τὸ πνεῦμα* (John iii. 5, 6, 8), *πνεῦμα Θεοῦ* (Matt. xii. 28; cf. Luke xi. 20, *ἐν δακτύλῳ*), or *πνεῦμα τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν* (Matt. x. 20), *τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον* (Matt. xii. 32; Mark iii. 29; cf. Matt. xxviii. 19; Acts i. 8), or *πνεῦμα ἅγιον* (Luke xi. 13), or, lastly, *τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας* (John xiv. 17, xvi. 13 [cf. 7 ff.], xv. 26).

And in the last passage the Spirit is called *ὁ παράκλητος*, the succourer of the apostles, inasmuch as, in the place of the visible presence of their Master, Christ, the Holy Ghost was to be sent them specially as the Spirit of truth, to be a constantly abiding principle within them (John xv. 26, or xiv. 26, cf. 16).

In proceeding, in the first place, to consider closely the Johannean discourses of Jesus on this subject, we find two chief sections in which the Spirit of God is directly spoken of. First, in the conversation with Nicodemus, in which the working of the Spirit is named in connection with all who have an interest in the divine kingdom, we read that without being born of the Spirit no man can see the kingdom of God, or enter into it (John iii. 3-10). And, besides this, the Spirit is spoken of, but only in a figure, as the living water (ch. iv.); and again, at the Feast of Tabernacles (vii. 37, 38), "If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink," together with the evangelist's interpretation (ver. 39). We next have our Lord's farewell discourses. These comprise both His teaching and His promises concerning the Holy Ghost, with especial reference to the apostles themselves, in furthering the object He here mainly has in view, viz. to prepare and fortify their minds for the approaching departure. And herein lies the gist of the whole matter; because the outpouring of the Spirit and His agency in Christ's people was to be in the future the immediate consequence of Christ's glorification.

Now the teaching of Jesus on this subject is essentially two-fold. It is concerned partly with the *relation of the Spirit to Christ*, in so far as the former is sent by the glorified Christ, and partly with the *effect of the Holy Ghost*, but this also in connection with Christ's work.

The Spirit is sent by the glorified Christ. Our Lord asserts that He sends Him from the Father (John xv. 26): "But when the *παράκλητος* is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, who proceedeth from the Father, He shall testify of me;" cf. xvi. 7: "If I depart, I will send Him unto you." Christ also imparts Him, as we see at xx. 22. The sending of the Spirit, through the Son, from the Father, is brought about in the following mode:—*He prays the Father to impart the Spirit to the disciples*, and the Father bestows Him upon them (John xiv. 16, 17); wherefore the Lord says also in another place that the Father will send the Spirit in His name (xiv. 26).

The Spirit proceeds from the Father (xv. 26), and, apart from any notion of outgoing, exists primordially in Him. But now we learn that He is from the Son. The Father sends Him in the Son's name, for His sake, and because the Son desires it for His purpose; because, indeed, the work of the Son, and consequently the glorification of the Father in Him, cannot otherwise be perfected. All may be summed up in the words, *for Christ's sake*.

It is brought about through Christ, as is clear from John xx. 22. The risen Christ, breathing upon His disciples, says to them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost. This must be regarded as something more than a mere promise, but yet not as standing in the place of the pentecostal effusion related in Acts ii. The former event rests on its own historical testimony, and is quite consistent with the latter, if we consider that the imparting of the Spirit is not in itself an absolutely momentary act. For, as the disciples become really receptive, through the resurrection of Christ and their subsequent intercourse with Him, and as the glorification of Christ begun at the resurrection is completed in the ascension, so we may believe that the imparting of the Spirit was begun and completed at these two periods respectively.¹ And thus it is in fact represented by the joint testimony of St. John's Gospel and the Acts, regarded as complementary to each other.

This sending of the Spirit is made conditional on the glorification of Jesus; for if Christ does not depart, the Spirit will not come. This going away includes Christ's exit from this life, and His departure to the Father, and consequently His death and glorification (xiv. 28). The imparting of the Spirit is made conditional on both these events, as well on the side of the disciples as on that of Christ Himself.

On the side of the disciples; because, so long as the Lord continued to go in and out amongst them, they would be too closely chained by the ascendancy of His personal presence, and receptive only with regard to Him, being unable to attain that self-dependence which was the very object for which the Spirit was imparted. Now His gift of the Spirit and the withdrawal of the Lord's sensible presence must either be simultaneous, or the latter must occur first; and even the relative separation between our

¹ Stier (*Words of the Apostles*) looks upon the action recorded (John xx. 22) as symbolical of the arrival of the promised Spirit, just as the Lord's Supper was instituted before His body was broken, or His blood shed.—Tr.

Lord and the disciples, which ensued at His death and lasted so short a time, was an important step towards rendering possible the imparting of the Spirit. For through His death they had become to a certain extent detached from His sensible presence, and awoke to a new perception of it after His resurrection, kept up as before by oral communication and the like. But this, in the later period, was strictly determinate in duration, and interrupted by considerable intervals between one appearance and another. During these intervals they had time to work out for themselves the results of what they had heard and seen, being at the same time, by the catastrophe in which they had taken part, detached more or less from dependence on their Lord's sensible presence. Consequently He could, as the Risen One, say even then in an inchoative sense, *λάβετε πνεῦμα ἅγιον* (John xx. 22).

But *on the side of Christ*, no less than on that of the disciples, the imparting of the Spirit was conditional on Christ's death and glorification. In His lowliness, indeed, He already possessed the Spirit without measure who had come down and remained upon Him; but yet, while His humiliation lasted, the Spirit was not, strictly speaking, communicable on His part. It was not until His temporal and lowly personality, subject as it was to the conditions of flesh and blood, was put off by His death, and until through the resurrection, and still more through the ascension, His manhood had been fully glorified, spiritualized, and illuminated, that His promise of imparting the Spirit could be fulfilled. Nothing less than the glorified Son in perfect unity with the Father could impart the Spirit; and even He could obtain this highest of all gifts from the Father for mankind whom He had redeemed, and impart it to them in the Father's name, only as having become through His passion the one Mediator and Intercessor, the High Priest and Saviour, received up into glory. In all these respects it may be seen how deeply grounded the condition was which He named as indispensable to the imparting of the Spirit: His departure from earth and going to the Father was inevitably presupposed. (It is, however, clear even from this how the Risen One (John xx. 22) could at once begin upon His work of imparting the Spirit.)

Consequently *this bestowal of the Spirit is essentially bound up with the indwelling of Christ in unity with the Father* in the disciples who believe on Him, love Him, and keep His word;

for such an indwelling was promised by our Lord Himself (John xiv. 23, cf. 21 and 26). And this exactly confirms what has been said as to the bestowal of the Spirit being dependent on Christ's glorification.

With regard to *the effect of the Holy Ghost sent by the glorified Christ*, Jesus expresses Himself (in St. John) first, generally, with reference to men as individuals and their relation to the kingdom of God, and then, particularly, with reference on one side to His disciples and the apostles, and on the other to the world.

(a) *The general effect of the Holy Ghost on individual men in relation to the kingdom of God is the new birth of (ἐκ) the Spirit* (John iii. 3-8). Immediately on being greeted by Nicodemus as a teacher come from God, Jesus, without allowing him to speak further, receives him with the definite assurance (ver. 3) that a new birth is the necessary condition of admittance into God's kingdom. Nicodemus' purpose had been to draw from Jesus a more explicit declaration concerning His mission, and the relation in which He stood to the Messianic kingdom; but our Lord replies in a manner calculated to lay hold of Nicodemus' mind, and to convince him that the question is not a theoretical one, but concerns that which he, Nicodemus, has to do; and that, moreover, the divine Teacher will not submit to be catechised, but that, on the contrary, the master in Israel must come to Him for instruction. To the strange question of Nicodemus (ver. 4) Jesus returns the same answer somewhat differently expressed (vers. 5-8). "*Ἀνωθεν*, from above, may be understood in the sense of *again* or *anew* (cf. *πάλιν ἄνωθεν*, Gal. iv. 9). If it is regarded as equivalent to *ἐκ Θεοῦ* (cf. i. 13), the words *ἐκ πνεύματος* would naturally follow as a direct explanation; but it is equally appropriate (vers. 5, 6, 7) to the other sense of the word. In either case the operation of the Spirit is here pointed out as an entire change and renewal. This does not proceed from man, who, being by his natural birth carnal, receives new life from the Spirit of God, inasmuch as to become spiritual, and thereby homogeneous to God's kingdom, and able as it were to see it (*ἰδεῖν*, ver. 5), and to partake of it. This operation, although incomprehensible to man, because not an object of arbitrary volition, is not the less thoroughly assured to Him (ver. 8). Jesus designates the operation of man's salvation by the general term *ζωοποιεῖν* (v. 21), as a bestowal of eternal life. And here, too, in like manner, He indicates the

operation which, emanating from Him, is to be carried on through the Spirit in naturally carnal man, for the purpose of making him a participant in the kingdom of God, by the name of a new birth (*γεννηθῆναι ἄνωθεν*). This is essentially the reception of a new life, wherein we are as entirely passive as at our real birth. The new birth, as an operation of the Spirit, is both a cleansing from sin, and also the entrance into being of a new moral personality. This answers to the signification of *πνεῦμα* as the quickening principle, and is characteristic of the teaching of Jesus concerning God. Various operations of the Divine Spirit are spoken of in the Old Testament as then taking place, but not this particular one. That God will impart His Spirit, and therewith a new heart, to men in the Messianic times, is certainly a subject of prophecy. Here, however, we have the culminating point of the operation of the Spirit in individuals. The Holy Ghost, as proceeding from Christ glorified, spiritualizes the carnal nature of mankind, conferring upon them a real personal existence in the Spirit. Henceforth we find the idea of a second birth attainable by Christianity running through the apostles' teaching, and not only of frequent occurrence in the first Epistle of St. John, but also in the writings of the two other apostolic *στόλοι* (Gal. ii.), James (i. 17, 18) and Peter (1 Epist. i. 23, cf. ii. 2). St. Paul, on the other hand, more frequently employs the image of the resurrection and that of a new creature, only once (Tit. iii. 5) speaking of the *παλιγγενεσία* in baptism (*λουτρὸν παλιγγενεσίας*).

But in a peculiar manner the Lord speaks specially of the Spirit in reference to the apostles as the first witnesses and confidential instruments of His work and kingdom; and in this connection expressly mentions in one place His direct operation upon the disciples, and then upon the world, before which they stand up as witnesses of Christ, which also is to believe on Him through their word (John xvii. 20).

Of the effect upon the apostles. To them the Spirit was to come as *παράκλητος*, which is rendered by Luther and the Eng. ver. as Comforter. But although *παρακαλεῖν* sometimes means to console, etc., yet *παράκλητος*, being a passive form, is not so properly an admonisher and consoler, but rather the one called to assist, the *advocatus*, counsel, or intercessor, first in a legal sense, and then transferred to other relations. (In that sense it has also passed into the rabbinical diction.) The Lord is the disciples' help

and counsel after the removal of His visible presence from among them; the Spirit was to be His substitute with the disciples, and is therefore called ἄλλος παράκλητος. He was not, however, to confront them in outward and visible presence like Christ Himself, but to be in them, without ever withdrawing His presence, as constantly as Christ had been in former days visibly standing at their side (John xiv. 17). The Spirit abides with them εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, and hence dwells in them permanently, and thereby becomes their guiding principle. And if it is asked what special effect the Spirit is to produce in them, we find the Lord declaring that special regard was to be paid to their impending duty as witnesses of Christ. In the character of an indwelling principle, the Holy Ghost was to work as the Spirit of truth, πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας (John xiv. 17, xvi. 13, xv. 26). They are to receive Him from the Father, in answer to the Son's prayer, as an abiding and indwelling principle, and in such a way that they may discern (xiv. 17) and be conscious of His presence (which the world cannot be). They will recognise Him as the Spirit of truth, inasmuch as He will actively manifest Himself as a principle pervading them, and constantly abiding with them; they will be conscious of Him, and He will lead them into all truth (εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν ὁδηγεῖν), and so prove Himself to be the Spirit of truth. He will not speak of Himself, but of that which concerns the Father and the Son (xvi. 14), and will impart divine knowledge, especially to the apostles, of what relates to the future development of His kingdom (xvi. 13),—both, however, with a view to the glorification of Christ (xvi. 14). He Himself asserts that by the communication of the Spirit (xiv. 16 sq., 20) the apostles will know that Christ is in the Father, and they in Christ, and He in them. The Spirit of truth was therefore to lead the apostles into the essential knowledge of the truth concerning the person of Christ, so far as He is in the Father and the Father in Him, and, in the next place, of that which concerned this community with Christ, so far as they are in Him and He in them. Consequently a mutual community of life takes place between them and Christ; and hence that which the Spirit imparts to them of the knowledge of the truth must also be a witness of Christ. And this is the true value of the expression, "He (the παράκλητος) shall testify of me" (xv. 26), and "shall glorify me" (xvi. 14). But what the Spirit imparts is, on the one hand, the

remembrance of Christ's own teaching (xiv. 26): "He shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance whatsoever I have said unto you;" and this in order to rescue His words from oblivion, and fix them for ever in their memory. On the other hand, the Spirit also imparts knowledge of the truth; because, *in addition to His office of reminding the disciples, He has also to teach them.* And this teaching, in so far as the Spirit "shall receive of Christ and show it unto you" (xvi. 14, 15), will be based upon a development of Christ's direct teaching, where not actually consisting in recalling His words to mind. The collective teaching of the Spirit has therefore the two characteristics of being founded on the teaching of Jesus, and of glorifying Him as the Christ. Its first object, however, is to fit the disciples for their apostolic calling as the trusted witnesses and authorized organs of Christ (cf. xv. 26, 27, and xx. 22, 23); and this stands (see above) in connection with the indwelling of Himself and of the Father which Christ promised (xiv. 23, 24 [26]), and as an effect of the Spirit, with the fact that the disciples in that day shall ask nothing more of Him (xvi. 23), but shall pray in the name of Jesus and find their requests granted. One other passage remains to be considered, in which the reception of the Spirit is placed in evident relation to the vocation of the apostles, —not, however, so much in their character of disciples as in that of authorized and accredited organs of Christ (John xx. 22, 23). Here He adds to His inchoative bestowal of the Holy Ghost, "Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them," etc. The opposite of remitting is retaining, by which the guilt and punishment of sin is asserted to be unremitted and unforgiven. The apostles could not by their own power forgive sins. Forgiveness is a divine act, which could, however, be accomplished through the apostles in virtue of a divine commission. With this commission they were now entrusted,—that of announcing to men on divine authority that their sins were forgiven or unforgiven. But in order to give validity to their sentence, the Holy Ghost was needed, that they might know and judge rightly of the inward condition and moral state of heart of the individuals with whom they had to do, and upon this ground either to grant or withhold the announcement of divine pardon. And this was not merely an intellectual endowment; because moral aptitude, a pure heart, and a sanctified will, no less than intellectual capacity, are

requisite for a right judgment of a man's moral state, to arrive at the truth and justly to enunciate the same. The authority given to Peter (Matt. xvi. 19), and extended to the other disciples (Matt. xviii. 18), is expressed in similar terms, but is of somewhat wider compass than this. For, although binding and loosing refer to the retention and remission of sins, and does not mean (as Lutz says) the act of binding to or loosing from the community, yet it is not limited to this, but, as that which is bound is also forbidden, and that which is loosed is allowed, extends also to the laying down of ordinances and decrees in the Lord's church, with this difference, that the authorization is not in St. Matthew expressly connected with the imparting of the Holy Ghost.

But all these utterances of the Lord, concerning the operations of the Holy Ghost upon the disciples, must no doubt be taken in connection *with their special apostolical calling*. In these men the Spirit was to bring about not only this second birth, or community of life with the Redeemer, whereby human powers in general are enlisted in the service of Christ and His kingdom, and man's carnal nature becomes spiritual, but, in particular, such an inner fulness of light and life as should place them in the position of apostolical witnesses for Christ, His chosen instruments and deputies in founding and guiding His church. Hence the apostles themselves, amongst the manifold gifts and vocations imparted and created by the Holy Ghost, always give the foremost place to the *apostolical* gift (1 Cor. xii. 28; Eph. iv. 11). But these gifts, even regarded in their special character, are not conferred on one person only,—the apostolical gift, for example, being bestowed on all the apostles; and similarly, in the new birth, all participate, and, so far as it transplants men into the community of life with Christ, is identical in all. Thus the Holy Ghost is the one divine power of life which animates all believers, and, transplanting them into a state of life-fellowship with their head, at the same time binds them all one to another in mutual love (John xiii. 34, xv. 12, 17). So far, and so far only, the Holy Ghost is undoubtedly the Spirit common to Christians. His operation is, however, by no means confined to believers, but extends also

To the world. The Holy Ghost, when He came, was also to make the world His object. As the Paraclete sent to the disciples, abiding in and working out from them, He was to "reprove

the world" (ἐλέγχειν (John xvi. 8-11) = convict, convince of, involving the idea of blame). This is the leading, or rather the characteristic, feature as regards the world, that the world, as such, stands in opposition to God, neither knowing nor loving Him, and in consequence neither knowing nor loving, but rather hating the Son likewise (John xvi. 2, 3). Now, when the Spirit makes this world the subject of His influence, His first and enduring operation must be to convince the world of error on its own part, and of right on the part of Christ and of God. Accordingly, the Lord says that the Spirit, when He is come to the disciples, will convince the world περὶ ἁμαρτίας, δικαιοσύνης, κρίσεως. And, first of all, with regard to the two subjects, ἁμαρτία and δικαιοσύνη (vers. 9, 10). The word ὅτι is explicative and expositive in both verses, explaining the sin that they believe not on Him; and the rendering *because* amounts to nearly the same thing. Here we see what are the subjects of the sin and of the righteousness respectively. The former is the world itself, which does not believe in Christ; the latter is Christ, who is Himself the righteousness, and is going to the Father, departing out of the visible world into the invisible. On the side of the world is sin, the sin of unbelief in Christ, by which sin the world rejected Him; and the first thing for the Spirit to effect is to convince the world of its sin committed through want of belief in Christ. And the world's incapacity with regard to the truth is not declared to be merely of the nature of sin, but that it is itself sin. Opposed to this sin stands righteousness, the righteousness of Christ. The words ὅτι ὑπάγω show that the divine speaker Himself is the subject of whom the Spirit will convince the world, firstly and chiefly, that He is righteous (δίκαιος, 1 John ii. 1), and is the person He declared Himself to be in this world, whom no one, as He Himself said, could convince of sin or untruth (John viii. 46); and as such being sanctioned and justified by the Father Himself, not only by His death and resurrection, but also by His departure to the Father. He is justified (1 Tim. iii. 16), and believers are made partakers of His justification. Hence, however, arises the third point, of which the Spirit will convince the world, viz. the judgment passed upon the prince of this world. The prince of this world is judged; and he must needs be not only continually kept separate from it, but at the last judgment finally rejected. But his cause is already lost (cf. John iii. 18), because Christ, the

δικαίος, is exalted to the Father, and whoever fails to attain righteousness in fellowship with Him must fall under the κρίσις, which is already passing and yet to pass upon the prince of this world. The world, then, has the choice proposed to it, whether to remain as it is, or to allow itself to be convinced by the working of the Spirit, and so to attain to the δικαιοσύνη. But the only way of salvation for it is to press onward to righteousness, through conviction of sin and of Christ's righteousness, and so to escape the κρίσις. The world, as such, is unable either even to see or know the Spirit; it requires to be awakened and convinced by Him before it can receive Him as a gift. On this effective ministry of the Spirit is founded our Lord's confident expectation that the world will, at least partially, come to believe on Him as the One sent by the Father (John xvii. 21). Thus the teaching of Jesus concerning the relation of the Spirit both to the Father and to Christ, and His operation upon the disciples and upon the world, forms a connected whole, although the utterances themselves do not externally amount to this.

Looking now from the Johannean to the synoptical sayings of Jesus, we see,

In reference to *the operation of the Holy Spirit in general*, that in Him are centred all the good gifts which the Father will give to those who ask Him (Luke xi. 13; cf. Matt. vii. 11). Add to this our Lord's answer to the question, "Who, then, can be saved?" asked by His disciples in their perplexity at what He had said about the young man who went away from Him sorrowful. His answer was, as He fixed His eyes upon them, "With man this is impossible, but with God all things are possible." Here we see that God the Father works in us, by the bestowal of His Spirit, the power of entering into the kingdom of God, the σωθῆναι; also, that salvation depends as essentially on the Holy Ghost as on the Father and the Son, is evident from the form of baptism (Matt. xxviii. 19).

In special reference to the disciples, the Lord promises that He will send them from on high the strength promised by the Father (Luke xxiv. 49), or that they shall receive the strength of the Holy Spirit shed upon them, in order to become thereby His witnesses (Acts i. 8, cf. 5). In His instructions to the apostles (Matt. x. 20; Luke xii. 12), the Lord had already told them to take no care how or in what words they should defend them-

selves, should it become necessary to do so, for that it is not they who would speak, but their Father's Spirit in them; adding later (Luke xxi. 15), that He will at the right moment give them *στόμα* and *σοφία*, to speak in their own defence.

As regards *the operation of the Spirit upon the world*, what St. John says of the *ἐλέγχειν* of the *πνεῦμα* is supplemented by the sayings of Jesus about the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost (Matt. xii. 32; Mark iii. 29; Luke xii. 10). Our Lord is here speaking of such an exhibition of the Spirit's agency as will compel His recognition by the world on which it is exercised. The world will, however, knowingly and willingly blaspheme Him, and thus oppose His operations, especially hindering them in the case of others. The Spirit appears here purely as a divine being; whereas the Son of man, although the Son of God also, appears constantly under a human form, in which blasphemy against Him may be susceptible of forgiveness. In the Spirit the Father and the Son are at the same time made manifest to men, and therewith is bestowed a witness in their inmost heart, a special experience not as yet found necessary so long as man was in personal intercourse with the Son. This involves a declaration of the fact that the Spirit, although no less truly of a divine nature, is distinct from the Father and the Son.

It is easily seen how, on this subject, *the synoptical discourses supplement, or at least give a joint testimony with those recorded by St. John*. In the latter respect, they bear undoubted evidence that the Lord really promised the Holy Ghost, and brought to light the peculiar agency He was about to assume in relation to the apostles and the world. And as regards the relation of the Spirit to Christ and to the Father, we see that, although the Johannean discourses are more explicit as to the communication of the Spirit, and the special conditions under which He was to be imparted, yet that the Synoptists also bear witness that our Lord must have spoken to much the same effect. On the one hand, He says less explicitly, "You will receive the power of the Spirit," or, "It is your Father's Spirit who speaks in you;" and, on the other, with greater precision, that the Father will give the Holy Ghost to those who ask Him (Luke xi. 13); and further, that He will send down upon the disciples the strength from on high promised by the Father, and will endow them with wisdom to speak in their own defence. Thus the synoptical utterances are in close and signi-

ficant connection with the Johannean, although the latter surpass the former in the explicitness of individual statements.

What, then, is the result arrived at by comparing both sides of the gospel teaching on the subject of the Holy Ghost? The question arises, whether and in what degree *the objective existence and the personality of the Holy Ghost* is deducible from it?

As regards the first point, there can be no doubt that, in the teaching of Jesus, the Holy Ghost is represented as an *objective Spirit* in respect to man, and is defined as operative and indwelling in human subjects,—the disciples, for instance,—but in no other way than as still being the Spirit of the Father, in whom men are made partakers through the intervention of Jesus Christ. He exists in and by Himself with the Father; from the Father He proceeds, and by the intervention of the Son is imparted and sent (John xv. 26, xvi. 14, 15). Whether He proceeds from the Father or from the Son (John xvi. 7, xv. 26), we may readily perceive that He is regarded in the passages quoted as existing not merely in man, but also objectively as a divine existence. The same is evident if we compare John vii. 39, where the subject is not the existence of the Spirit generally, nor His operation under the Old Testament dispensation, but only His communication to Christian believers. The objective existence of the Holy Ghost is clear from Matt. xxviii. 19, where baptism is enjoined in the name of all three Persons. This *ὄνομα τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος* represents Him in His objective existence. But this leads us to the second question,

Whether the Lord's discourses do not lead further to *the personality of the Holy Ghost*? There can be no doubt that the turn of expression, both in the discourses in St. John and elsewhere, is such as would be used in speaking of a person. The Father, says Jesus, sends the Spirit in my name (John xiv. 16), as He Himself is come in the Father's name (v. 43). The Spirit is the *παράκλητος*, who, as the substitute of Christ, was, we know, to be the helper and guide of the apostles (xv. 26, xiv. 16). This is expressed just as if a person was spoken of; and, moreover, where *τὸ πνεῦμα ἅγιον* is the subject, we find the masculine pronoun *ἐκεῖνος* used (xvi. 13, 14, and xiv. 26), always, indeed, referring to *παράκλητος*, even when that word is not close to it, but still showing that *τὸ πνεῦμα ἅγιον*, as an independent subject, is intended by the speaker (xiv. 26, cf. 16). In the Synoptists, too, we must

remember that it says (Matt. x. 20), "It is the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you,"—He, therefore, being the speaking subject. But here arises the question, whether this mode of representation is intended as more than a personifying form; and in some of the discourses there might be a just reason and aim for such a rhetorical personifying, especially in our Lord's farewell discourses, where His object was to comfort the disciples, and emphatically point out to them the community of life subsisting between Himself and the Father, in which they were for the future to find all the illumination and strength which their position required. It would be in harmony with this object to speak of the Holy Ghost as a person, although not in a literal sense, and to use the word *παράκλητος* with distinct reference to that object. But since this result might have been equally well attained by pointing the disciples to Himself as the Christ shortly to be glorified for ever, who would not leave them orphans, but would come again and bestow His Spirit upon them, for what purpose, it might be asked, need the Spirit have been personified? for our Lord's object would be perfectly effected by the indwelling of the Son and of the Father (xiv. 21, 23, cf. 18). Why, then, add the temptation to such a misunderstanding? A hint of the Spirit's personality is traceable also in the parallelism pointed out (John iii.) to the natural phenomena of wind, *τὸ πνεῦμα ὅπου θέλει πνεῖ* (ver. 8), implying that the Spirit too has a will (cf. 1 Cor. xii. 11). Add to this, in our Lord's speeches there is *nothing against* the Spirit's personality. As regards the general biblical representation, the fact has been appealed to, that the Holy Ghost is described as something which may be poured out. This is no doubt correct, although it does not occur in the discourses of Jesus Himself. Yet in Jesus' words we read of *being endued* with power from on "high" (Luke xxiv. 49) as the reception of the Holy Ghost, or rather of His power (Acts i. 8). That which is received, however, and wherewith men are endued is power, but it is the power of the "Spirit *which is to come upon you.*" This implies the independence of the Spirit. He Himself comes, and His power is imparted in the way spoken of. The figure of outpouring may be similarly regarded. The power of the Holy Ghost is poured out, and the symbol of this is the living water, refreshing and life-giving; and in this symbol only does the mention of drinking, overflowing, and becoming a fountain of living water

occur. In short, nothing of any weight can be cited from the discourses of Jesus against the personality of the Holy Ghost; and the words (John xvi. 14, 15), "He shall receive of mine and show it unto you," need not raise a doubt. For if we infer that, because the Spirit will glorify Christ by taking of what belongs to Him, the former is nothing of Himself, this proves too much, since Christ also says that everything which the Father has is His (xvi. 15, xvii. 10), and *vice versâ*. And as our Lord clearly does not in those words in any way intend to deny His own special personality and independence in reference to the Father, neither can the words above quoted of the Spirit be adduced against His individuality, but as expressing the unity of being and close reciprocity of vital action subsisting between the Father, Himself, and the Spirit. In other parts of the New Testament, where the Spirit is spoken of in the fullest detail, attributes appear in which He is described as a personal subject (1 Cor. xii. 11).¹ Lastly, there is the analogy between the doctrine concerning the Son and the Spirit, viz. that as the Son is sent by the Father, so is the Spirit sent by the Father, in the name and through the intervention of the Son. And, inasmuch as in the Johannean discourses the pre-existence of the Son is expressly asserted, it is quite in harmony if we assume as predicates concerning the Spirit, that He not only possesses generally an objective existence, but also a distinct individual personality. And the formula of baptism (Matt. xxviii. 19) gives peculiar weight to this analogy, where the words *ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς, κ.τ.λ.*, lead us to the same point, the name of the Holy Ghost pointing to the personal existence of the Spirit, which is indeed the culminating point of the teaching of Jesus and of the New Testament concerning Him. The subject, however, is not yet exhausted; but we now pass on to a further result, which must be separately dealt with.

§ 25. *Father, Son, and Spirit.*

Here we have at last a perfect conception of God. In the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, He is represented to us entirely according to Christ's teaching. Hence the synoptical

¹ Peter's words addressed to Ananias and Sapphira (Acts v. 3, 4, 9) distinctly speak of a *lying to* and a *temptation of a personality*. In ver. 3 the Holy Ghost is made equivalent to God.—TR.

passage (Matt. xxviii. 19) forms the climax in the representation of the risen Christ, and herein the evangelist puts the finishing stroke to his narrative of the Messianic life. Here, after revealing Himself to the eleven on the mountain He had before pointed out to them, the risen Christ uttered those memorable words: "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatever I have commanded you; and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." This is evidently the climax of the evangelical history, the completion of our Lord's testimony to Himself, wherein He asserts the glorification of His personality with reference to His divine authority, and confers upon the disciples their peculiar apostolical commission, with the promise conformable to it. No wonder that His whole teaching is concentrated on this point, and indeed in connection with the injunction of baptism on the apostles. Thus a beautiful consistency is given to the whole.

Yet *the historical character of this passage has been strongly called in question* (as by Teller and De Wette). It has been said (1) that St. Mark knows nothing of it (cf. xvi. 16); but we know that many things are related more copiously by one evangelist, and more briefly by another, and that the latter part of St. Mark's Gospel is evidently condensed. There does not, therefore, seem to be much weight in the objection. It is said (2) that such a reflective summary of the threefold view of God might have occurred to the apostles (2 Cor. xiii. 14), but hardly in Christ's teaching, and, even with the former, hardly as a subject of confession. But what St. Matthew gives is neither of these, but simply the complete expression of the nature of God manifested in the gospel to point out the signification of baptism. Considered from this point of view, this statement might quite well occur; indeed, it is in a manner necessary. This was exactly the right point for its introduction; nor could the Lord have used such a complete expression at any earlier time than this, when the disciples not only did not stumble at it, but were approaching the state in which they could take in its full meaning. Not until they had seen and recognised their risen Lord in His elevation, and revolved in their minds the great fact of the resurrection, then, but not earlier, were they capable of receiving such a declaration.

A further objection is derived from the comparison of the baptismal formula with the account given in the Acts of the Apostles. It is doubted whether in the Acts baptism really took place in the name of the Father, Son, and Spirit; and it is concluded from Acts viii. 16, that any reference to baptism in the name of the Holy Ghost is wanting in the apostolical times, at least on some occasions. The Samaritans who had been converted by Philip are being there spoken of, a considerable number of whom, and amongst them Simon Magus, had been baptized. And when the tidings reached Jerusalem, Peter and John were sent down, and prayed with the new converts, in order that they might receive the Holy Ghost; for He had not yet fallen upon them, only they were baptized in the name of Jesus. But a man may be baptized in the Holy Ghost without His having fallen upon the baptized person (Acts viii. 16); and the stress is here laid upon the fact of their mere baptism, not upon their having received baptism exclusively in the name of Jesus, which is not at all implied in the passage. They had been baptized without having received the Spirit; and the expression "in the name of Jesus" may well have been an abbreviation, by no means implying that the act was not performed in the name of the Father, Son, and Spirit. It must not be assumed that Philip the deacon baptized differently from the apostles,—an assumption which must be made if this baptism administered by him in the name of Jesus had no reference to the name of the Holy Ghost. Indeed, from Acts xix. 2-5, the contrary might as easily be maintained. Paul asked some disciples whom he met at Ephesus whether they received the Holy Ghost after they believed. Their reply was, "We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost;" whereupon Paul asks again, "Unto what then were ye baptized?" and they said, "Unto John's baptism." Here it is very obvious to conclude that, since Paul presupposes they must, if baptized rightly, have heard somewhat of the Holy Ghost, baptism was performed also in the name of that person. We may thus conclude that it cannot be proved from the Acts of the Apostles that baptism was in the earliest ages of Christianity performed without reference to the Holy Ghost. (3) It is said that the scruples which the apostles at first felt about baptizing the heathen are not consistent with our Lord's command to visit and baptize all nations. But these scruples, whether on the part of the apostles

(Acts x.), or of the Christians at Jerusalem (xi. 1-3), had no regard to the general question of baptizing the heathen, or teaching them the Christian religion, but only to the point whether they were to receive baptism without having been first admitted into the Old Testament covenant by circumcision. The apostles might, from their then existing standpoint, easily cherish this scruple, without at all forgetting the general injunction to baptize. From this, therefore, no conclusion can be drawn against the genuineness of the injunction as recorded by St. Matthew; and, according to the earliest historical testimony, apart from the New Testament (Justin Martyr, for instance), baptism was administered in the prescribed form.

If, from what has been said, we do not hesitate to regard the command to baptize as of like credibility with the other recorded utterances of Jesus, it remains only to consider its signification. In order to make disciples of all nations, the apostles were commanded to baptize them in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, to teach them, and to observe all things which the Lord has commanded. Therefore the consecration resulting from the act of immersion is to be conferred upon them in that name. The relation of the act of baptizing to God and Christ being often expressed by a preposition with *ὄνομα*, we often find *βαπτίζειν* in connection with that word (cf. טביל לשם in proselyte baptism, see Bindseil in Ullm. and Umbr. *Stud. und Krit.* 1832),—for example, ἐπὶ τῷ (Acts ii. 38), to indicate the aim and condition of the act; ἐν τῷ (x. 48), showing that the act of baptism is rooted and rests in the name; and lastly (in the formula itself), εἰς τὸ ὄνομα, to express the general reference of the act of consecration to the name of God.

The name of God is pronounced over men and laid upon them (see Num. vi. 27), firstly, in a biblical view, in order to secure a blessing, God being therein present for their salvation (so Justin, *Apol.* i. 61). The use of the name of God is therefore an act of consecration, in which the name is pronounced over the baptized person with a view to his blessing and salvation, that God may be present with His mercy and may bring him salvation.

But the name is also used in invocation, worship, and confession, wherein the believer expresses and avails himself of this presence of God Himself. Baptism is administered in God's name in this twofold sense, that God is henceforward present to

the baptized person as his salvation, and may be invoked by him ; and the word *ὄνομα* indicates the name of God in this connection in its threefold application. Lutz, indeed, says (*Bibl. Dog.* p. 333) that the juxtaposition of the names is no proof of their equality,—that the Son remains subordinated to God, the latter bestowing glory, the former receiving it, but still as the One conceived, consecrated, and sent forth from God. Divinity, he adds, belongs to the Son, in so far as He, in His spirit, will, and work, is inseparably bound up with God, and is undoubtedly, in His character as Son, God's representative in human nature without obscuring Him. The Holy Ghost he represents as the divine power, working effectually in human nature for light and sanctification, and possessing divinity but not personality. This, however, is not a faithful interpretation of the sense, and there are substantial reasons against it.

Supposing Jesus to be conscious of His pre-existence, the requirements of His being are not satisfied by His representation of God in human nature ; for in Himself and in this pre-existence He already stands in a relation of unity to God, and of distinction from Him as the Father. Nor, as we have already shown, is the Spirit merely the manifestation of a divine power.

Although the juxtaposition of the subject does not of itself necessarily imply equality, yet the uniform relation of baptism to all three names does so. Each of them is a *divine* ground of salvation, since for this there can be no other than a divine ground ; and it is difficult to see why the Spirit, if He were nothing but the power of God, should be so expressly mentioned, especially in addressing those who were accustomed to the Old Testament usage in the name of God.

The doctrine of the Son's pre-existence and of the distinct personality of the Spirit is supplemented by the administration of baptism in their name as well as in that of the Father. Although the matter directly in question is only the foundation of salvation in the Son and in the Spirit, still indirectly some light is thrown upon the nature of both. The Son, we know, has life in Himself : how then will it be with the Spirit ? At all events, the difference does not involve absolute inequality, since the equality of causal relation in which, in baptism, each stands to salvation imparts a unity even in their difference ; and it is just this interlacing of their relations which gives fulness and life to

the conception of the Christian's God, and in the highest degree of Jesus Himself. Thus it is a synoptical passage which throws new light in a deeper connection upon the nature of the Son and Spirit, our knowledge of which is derived chiefly from the utterances recorded by St. John.

Some passages in the farewell discourses in St. John's Gospel serve as illustrations of this subject (John xiv. 16, 17, cf. 20, 21, 26),—"I will pray the Father, and He shall give you another Paraclete, that He may abide with you for ever." It is the Father who, in answer to the prayer of the Son, gives the Spirit as a continual help abiding in the disciples. And through this Spirit the disciples will know that Christ is in the Father, and that there exists between them and Christ a mutual fellowship of life. So also, in ver. 26, the Father sends the Spirit in the Son's name; the Son is the efficient cause of this mission; the Spirit glorifies Christ, and carries His work to still further results. In John xv. 26 the three are similarly placed together: the Spirit goes forth, and Christ sends Him from the Father. Again (xvi. 7-15) the Spirit who is sent as Paraclete glorifies Christ, for what He imparts is of Christ.

From these passages we learn the unity of the three; for in none of them is there any overstepping from the Godlike into the likeness of a creature. All three are the active principle of divine salvation just as in the baptismal formula, the latter being no more than the consequent setting forth of the fundamental idea herein contained. In this way the testimony on each side confirms that on the other. But the *distinction*, no less than the unity of the three, takes a prominent and characteristic place in the Johannean discourses in which the agency of the divine persons is spoken of. In the formula of baptism, it is only indicated by their juxtaposition as the ground of salvation, whilst the Johannean passages express it more in detail by a statement of their action. In their juxtaposition, it is a matter of course that the Father holds the foremost place, for the Son Himself points to Him as the one from whom He has received power to have life in Himself (John v. 26; cf. Col. ii. 9). The Spirit is He whom the Son had without measure; and because He had Him in such totality as God-man, where it must have taken place through moral intervention, we see the Spirit actually descend upon Him at His baptism. All communication of the

Spirit is immediately bound up with the glorification of the Son. He proceeds, indeed, from the Father, but only through the Son's intervention. And hence it follows that the Spirit, no less than the Father and the Son, is a perfect divine being. God is a spirit (John iv. 24). The Lord is a spirit (2 Cor. iii. 17); and the Spirit, when He is named on His own account, is no other than the one here named. When any divine life is to be implanted, it is done through the influence, or rather indwelling, of this Spirit. This, however, always stands in connection with the indwelling of Christ and of the Father Himself in believers (John xiv. 23),—a proof how they belong to each other, and how we with all three always remain in the same circle of the one divine being. So it is also in the conversation with Nicodemus (John iii): the Spirit, as something truly divine, is the principle of the second birth (vers. 3–8), and as such is again distinguished from the Father and Son (cf. ver. 16).

Now this is just the peculiarity which we find unexampled in the whole world. The unity of being, combined with a threefold personality, is the divine fulness of life and perfection of personality, which in its richness and life defines the Christian idea of God. But certainly, in our present state of knowledge, seeing as we do “in a glass darkly” (*ἐν αἰνίγματι*), it remains veiled from us in an obscurity which we strive in vain to penetrate. And so the Lord says, no man hath ever seen God except the Son. And yet the apostles clearly attest the fundamental conception of His nature (2 Cor. xiii. 13; cf. 1 Cor. xii. 4–6; 1 Pet. i. 2; Rev. i. 4–6). The dogma of a triune God, Father, Son, and Spirit, is indispensable as the foundation, or, some would say, as the hypothesis, for the Christian doctrine of salvation; and Christ Himself led the apostles to believe in it, without thinking it necessary to enter into detailed explanations of the inner being of God in this threefold relation.

It is an interesting question, why the nature of the Holy Ghost, in particular, is veiled in such obscurity. The darkness which envelopes the Triad refers especially to two points: first, the unity of the three, which, as an equality, is single in its character; and, secondly, the aspect under which, in this Triad, the manifestation of the Lord in the world is to be regarded,—as concerns the Son, in so far as He is at the same time Son of God and Son of man; so that obscurity rests not only on the Trinitarian re-

lation of the Son to the Father and to the Spirit, but also on the connection of the pre-existing Christ with the man Jesus. Yet this manifestation among mankind of the one who existed before the foundation of the world is well known to us, because it has become matter of history, and not only lay hidden in Christ's self-consciousness after His appearance, but also declared itself in His testimony. The case of the Spirit is somewhat different, in whom, likewise, God works and dwells in the world; although the Spirit had not (in our Lord's time) adequately asserted His manifestation as a person in the same way as the pre-existent Christ had done by His appearance as the God-man. The latter, indeed, possessed the Spirit without measure, but not the Spirit in the Trinitarian sense; and, consequently, at the point then reached in the course of divine revelation the Spirit was not adequately manifested as the Spirit; and therefore, so far, the personality of the Spirit is not so plainly evident as that of the Son in His pre-existence. He is, indeed, promised by Christ, and essentially delineated in the promise itself, which, however, has been filled only up to a certain point, but is not yet complete. The community of Christ is not yet complete; the union of the whole spiritual world with Christ its Head is not yet in reality fully accomplished. There is a stage still before us in the course of divine revelation (as may be inferred from our Lord's own teaching) at which the Spirit will be for the first time revealed in His fulness, and at which, consequently, His personal life and being will be set in evidence before us. Until then, however, man's knowledge of the Triad has not yet reached its highest attainable limits, even though we suppose that man can never perfectly penetrate its depths. But this assumption itself may not be altogether admissible, if, at least, we base our view on the words, "We shall know, even as we are known,"—which is a sufficient reason, in reference to the culminating point of our Lord's teaching about the nature of God as Father, Son, and Spirit, to induce us to continue to pursue our investigations with all reverence and humility. Thus some passages remain, which appear to stand in relation to this teaching, which have not been investigated as much as might be possible. In reference to the still future manifestation of the Spirit, we cannot but remember how the Church is called the Bride of the Lord (Rev. xxii. 17), and what is said of a revelation of the whole *πολυ-*

ποίκιλος σοφία (Eph. iii. 10), and the *πᾶσα πατριὰ* in heaven and earth (Eph. iii. 15),—a future manifestation of the Spirit, of which a hint, but no more, is given in 1 Cor. xii.

From this point, where we see how much modesty and reverence are needed for the comprehension of the subject, it is interesting to turn back once more to the Old Testament, and to inquire how far this culmination of the New Testament conception of God is there pre-signified or stated. Now, in the ancient theology of our Church, it was thought, as a matter of course, that the doctrine of the Trinity was to be found in the old covenant; but certainly the exegetical proofs adduced are insufficient to prove the idea. These proofs are mainly either the passages in which the plural form of the name of God is used with a singular verb, and *vice versâ*, or those which show a plurality in the divine attributes,—such as the thrice *Holy* of Isaiah, and others to the same effect. It must not, however, be overlooked that traces exist in the Old Testament of a tendency towards that fuller development of doctrine on this subject which is found in the New Testament teaching, especially in that of our Lord. Thus it is important to observe the prominent position given to the angel of Jehovah, the angel of the Lord *κατ' ἐξοχίην*, partly to distinguish Him from the lower angels, and partly to identify Him with Jehovah, with God Himself. This angel of God appears in Gen. xvi. 10, 11, cf. 13, xxi. 17 seq., xxii. 1 seq. (11), xxxi. 11 seq. (xxxii. 25); Ex. xiv. 19, xxiii. 20 seq., xxxii. 34, and some later passages. His attributes have also been compared (Isa. lxiii. 9). The angel of the Lord, or of the covenant, appears in the later prophets (Mal. iii. 1), and then also in relation to the Messianic expectation (cf. Dan. x.), Zech. i.–vi. So much the more remarkable is it that Daniel himself represents as a Son of man Him who was to have everlasting dominion over all nations (viii. 13, 14). The wielder of divine sovereignty is here represented as coming from heaven; and this forms the link between this passage and others in the later prophets, where the angel of the covenant is bound up with the hope of the Messiah. Here, however, He appears as the Son of man, in which character the wielder of the divine sovereignty is now represented, instead of, as heretofore, in that of an angel of Jehovah; and thus may we imagine the course of development to be. The appearances of the angel were merely momentary; and his words and deeds were looked upon as those of the Lord Him-

self. This, which is the first mention of His becoming man, forms an element in the development of Trinitarian doctrine, and the germinating point in the Old Testament with which the teaching of Jesus is connected; it is the angel of the Lord who, as the substratum of Messianic expectation in the prophets, brings at length into view the Lord Himself personally present amongst men.

A second Old Testament element is that of the *divine wisdom*. This assumed a position of ever-growing importance amongst the divine attributes till it approached the form of an hypostasis. Finally, we have to notice the manner in which God's word and God's Spirit were displayed as modes of revealing the Godhead (Ps. xxxiii. 6). In each of these terms there is a gradual unfolding of doctrine, in which, little by little, the idea assumes a definite shape, resulting at last in the fully developed doctrine of the Trinity,—the Word of God having at length, by successive steps, become the *Λόγος* in the prologue of St. John's Gospel (cf. Heb. iv. 12). In the *Λόγος*, Word and Wisdom alike find their highest expression (since *λόγος* = *reason* as well as *word*), and hence become merged into one. Therein Wisdom and the creative Word are united. The New Testament teaching concerning the Spirit is, however, nothing more than the completion of the primitive doctrine of the Old concerning the breath of His mouth.

II. THE REDEMPTION OF MAN.

§ 26. *Introductory Summary.*

That the teaching of Jesus concerning the glorification of the Father in the Son stands in a definite relation to sinful man, is clear from John xvii. 4, where He says that He has glorified the Father on earth, and consequently amongst men; and this, in fact, through the completion of His work by revelation of the Father. As He goes on to say (xv. 8) that the Father is honoured and glorified by the fact of His disciples existing and abiding in Him, that they may bring forth fruit, so He regards His own glorification, not merely as a glorification in or with God, but in His own people also, to be effected by the Holy Ghost dwelling in them (John xvi. 14). It rests upon men being drawn to Him and taking part in His glory, and therefore upon

the authority conferred on Him, to give eternal life to all those whom the Father has given Him, whereby both Father and Son are honoured (v. 23); these being, indeed, given Him out of the world (ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου, xvii. 6). His own are still in the world, and exposed to its dangers; but they are sent into it only that through their word others also may believe on Him (xvii. 11, 14, 18). There is, therefore, a glorification of the Father through the Son in the κόσμος, in the midst of sinful humanity, in those who have emerged from its entanglements.

Thus the glorification becomes identified with redemption, and this whole operation of Jesus in the world is pointed out as a deliverance from sin and rescue from destruction (iii. 16, 17), or as a communication of everlasting life (John v. 24, x. 28, vi. 39, [47–58]), which name He then appropriates to Himself (xi. 25, xiv. 6). The same idea is involved in various figurative expressions, such as the *Water of Life* (iv. 14, vii. 37), the *Bread of Life* (vi. 48), the *Light* (viii. 12, ix. 5, xii. 46), the *Way* (xiv. 6), and the *Good Shepherd* (x. 11); and it is also found in the Synoptists, where we read of man coming to the Father through Jesus only (Matt. xi. 27), of His revealing Himself to babes, of His setting free the weary and heavy laden from their burden, of His giving His life a ransom for them (Matt. xx. 28, xxvi. 28), of His having come to save the lost (Matt. xviii. 11, [xv. 24, x. 6;] Luke 15), and of His being the Physician of the spiritually sick (Matt. ix. 12, 13; Luke xix. 10, etc.).

§ 27. *The Object of Redemption—Man.*

The teaching of Jesus embraces both sides of man's nature, his *dignity*, and also his *need of redemption*; but in His discourses the latter predominates. This is consistent both with His own vocation as a Redeemer, and with the actual condition of mankind, to the consciousness of which they must be aroused so that He might be recognised in that capacity. It was impossible to develop the first point properly unless the second were first placed in a clear light. The great results which our Lord purposed in the world could be realized only by indirect means, as, first of all, the power proceeding from Him must operate negatively for the counteraction of sin and its ruin. He could not, therefore, in His teaching, simply set forth the dignity of man, and address Himself to it alone, but He must needs proceed on the closest

discrimination between good and evil, between what was agreeable and what was opposed to the divine nature, between life and death. Herein He could connect His teaching closely with the Old Testament, in which man is regarded mainly from the same side, although there are passages in which the other view prevails. For the Old Testament begins with the primitive dignity of man; and, without its being expressly stated afterwards, this side of man's nature is kept in the foreground, as of one elevated and distinguished by God above the whole earthly creation, as, *e.g.*, in the 8th Psalm; and in every other place where sin is treated of, the other side also is more or less taken into consideration. And it is particularly characteristic of the biblical mode of view, that it never gives man up, so to speak, but, amidst all the ruin and decay, which it distinctly regards, it points at a divine plan of salvation for fallen man. However much, therefore, men may appear, according to the Old Testament, to follow their self-chosen way, they are, nevertheless, under the guidance of a divine plan of salvation, which historically draws the descendants of Abraham and Jacob first within its influence, but yet, from the very first, aims at including all the families of the earth. Thus in Holy Scripture, in spite of its clear view of ruin as the consequence of sin in mankind, there is also a much more comforting perception of the latter in virtue of the divine plan controlling it; the idea of the divine salvation is ever more and more developed, whereby also a higher conception of man and human nature is gradually produced. Mankind is looked upon as in need of redemption, and yet as called to a peculiar fellowship with God. And so also with the didactic discourses of Jesus Himself. The more prominently the community with God to which men are called is brought forward in the New Testament, so much the more is the dignity peculiar to man indirectly enforced, and in some passages also with evident design.

The doctrine of *human dignity*, as the first side of anthropology, occurs directly in those only of our Lord's discourses which we may call preparatory, because they do not lead us to the central point of His teaching. The same doctrine may, however, be traced indirectly in the other discourses also, seeing that even in redemption itself the exaltation of man's nature and destiny is plainly implied.

The Lord expresses Himself negatively about the dignity of man, compared with the lower creatures, in those discourses where

He wishes to represent works of human love as a duty, in order to show that He was right in healing the sick on the Sabbath (Luke xiii. 15 seq.; Matt. xii. 11 seq.). Other speeches also may come under consideration, in which Jesus seeks to raise men's minds to a living trust in God, as opposed to a low state of earthly sensuality (Matt. vi. 30; Luke xii. 28); and in like manner also to steel them against fear of men and dread of suffering (Matt. x. 31). In these discourses He refers to the lower creatures, which are so bounteously and strictly cared for by God, in contrast to the higher dignity of man, who in God has a heavenly Father (Matt. vi. 26; Luke xii. 24).

The positive aspect of the dignity of man is implied in his peculiar relation to God, this relation resulting from the idea of God as a Father. God is the originator in man of a life which is the counterpart of His own, and has created him for a personal fellowship with Himself. Man can become the child of God in a deeper sense, as is expressed, in contrast to the heathen view (Luke xii. 30), in the exhortation to confidence in God. Man is called on to seek the kingdom of God, a blessing on which every other good thing depends (Matt. vi. 33; Luke xii. 31, 32), which, too, God as his Father is willing to give him. This relation of man to the Father becomes most evident, through the doctrine that the Son, although the Son of God and one with the Father, is nevertheless the Son of man, and most frequently describes Himself as such. Hence results the specially Christian idea of human nature as admitting of a personal union with the Godhead, and in this very union fulfilling, indeed, the complete idea of humanity, and also, even apart from this union, as being at all events susceptible of intimate fellowship with God. This latter idea is the aim of the whole of that portion of God's economy which depends on the appearance of the Son of man, and is also only the reverse side of the idea of God as a Father. God reveals Himself in man and is glorified in him, and man is glorified in God. On account of the sinfulness in man, this does not take place through any development of his own nature, but because humanity (as believing in the Son) finds in the Son of God and man the guarantee of this glorification. This is evident in the preparative didactic discourses of Jesus, *e.g.* in the Sermon on the Mount, in which, without any distinct reference to the Redeemer, the dignity of man is very forcibly brought forward,

not only generally as regards his destination in the kingdom of God (Matt. v. 3), but also specially in the requisition to be perfect as God is perfect (Matt. v. 48). As a plain result therefrom, full trust in God is inculcated, especially in reference to earthly necessities; when so high a spiritual destination is in question, and is made attainable by God's fatherly hand, the satisfaction of these lower needs must be a subordinate matter, to be committed to this Father in all quiet submission. Man is not created for the earth, but for heaven, where his treasure is to be.

Some of the references to the dignity of man, which are prominently brought forward by Jesus, are as follows:—

He attributes to man a *personal life* which is *superior to all external force*, and *cannot even be destroyed by the death of the body*, yet is entirely dependent on God (Matt. x. 28; Luke xii. 4, 5; in which passages God and *not* the devil is to be understood as the object of right fear).¹ In addition to this recognition, we have, further, the distinction between *σῶμα* and *ψυχὴ*, and the *continuance of man after death*, both of the spiritual and also the bodily element (Matt. x. 28). Also, wherever the redemption of man is spoken of, the twofold element is always taken into account, the *ζωὴ* being understood as the *ζωὴ* of the spirit and of the corporeal part; and hence the resurrection is usually mentioned at the same time (John v. 24, 28, 29, vi. 39 f., 44, 54, xi. 25; cf. Luke xiv. 14, xx. 35, 36). In virtue of this higher being, superior to all external power and indestructible by death, man does not belong to the earth alone, but also has to do with *an invisible order of things*, into which he will some day be transferred (Luke xii. 20, 21; Matt. vi. 19–21; cf. Luke xii. 33, 34). Jesus assumes a relation existing between man and an *invisible spirit-world*, which is described by Him as partly *hostile* and partly *friendly* to man (Matt. xiii. 39, xviii. 10; Luke xv. 10; John viii. 44); also, as regards Himself, this world of spirits takes both a friendly (John i. 52) and also a hostile aspect (Matt. iv. 1–11).

Again, as regards *the soul of man*, Jesus recognises *in man a spiritual eye* (Matt. vi. 22, 23; cf. Luke xi. 34–36), by means of which he receives and possesses light in respect to his relation to God. Just as the possession and enjoyment of material light depend entirely on the state of the bodily eye, so the possession of spiritual light on the state of the spiritual eye. If the bodily

¹ Other commentators affirm the contrary idea.—TR.

eye is healthful, the whole body possesses light; in the contrary case, it is in entire darkness. If the spiritual eye is healthful, then the entire man enjoys the higher spiritual light of which he is in need. But all depends on this inward light not being darkened (Luke xi. 35). If it shines clearly, the man, far from possessing this light for himself alone, will perhaps become a bright luminary to those in darkness around him (cf. Matt. v. 14 ff.). Rationalism has attributed great importance to these passages, and from them has sought to infer the existence of an active principle of religious perception in man himself, and consequently the faculty of independent religious thought and examination. But it is the mere *receptibility* which is here spoken of, which is of course not merely passive (pure passiveness cannot exist where living dynamic powers are at work). As light must come to the eye from without,—thus, with regard to the spiritual eye, Jesus speaks here in harmony with His teaching as to the manifestation of the Son through the Father (Matt. xi. 27, xvi. 17),—and as the bodily eye must be susceptible of the light of the sun; so must the spiritual eye possess something of divine light in order to perceive the light from above, but yet *only* to *perceive* it. This receptibility becomes *spontaneity* when the water which He gives to men to drink becomes in them a well of living water (John iv. 14). At the same time, Jesus supposes the case that this spiritual eye may be perverted, so that the man is deprived of light (Luke xi. 34).¹ He requires His disciples to *ponder on divine things* (Matt. xi. 15, xiii. 14). They are to take heed how they hear (Mark iv. 24), and especially to form righteous judgments (John vii. 24), and therefore to examine and discern the signs of the times (Luke xii. 56, 57). To him, however, who conscientiously makes use of the spiritual insight afforded him, He promises continual inward growth (Matt. xiii. 12; Mark iv. 25; Luke viii. 18; John viii. 31, 32). He specially attributes to man a *power of knowing the divine will*,—a power which is to be in him the groundwork of his faith. He makes this faith dependent on man's inclination to do the will of God (John vii. 17); but this, apart from the teaching of the Lord Himself, presupposes as existing in us a knowledge of the divine will about us. He also presupposes that the man who is inclined to do the divine will will be able to make His teaching the subject of his medita-

¹ See page 70.

tion and examination. But this very inclination is not considered by Him as a mere affair of *human power*; for every one who is susceptible of the Lord's teaching is *of God* (John viii. 47); his works are done in God (John iii. 21); he is drawn by the Father (John vi. 44); and his power is given him by the Father (John vi. 65). In full harmony with this, when Peter, in the name of the disciples, confessed his faith in Jesus as the Son of God, He says to him (Matt. xvi. 17), "Flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee,"—which expression is used by way of synecdoche, as the chief elements of the human body for the whole of the material life or the entire human nature, but still always contrasted with the spiritual element (Gal. i. 16, cf. 15; cf. 1 Cor. xv. 50). This contrast is forcibly expressed in Matt. xxvi. 41, and we thence recognise the fundamental view of the Lord as to the *nature and condition of man*.

So long as this contrariety exists between the flesh and the spirit, it prevents man from thoroughly attaining to that higher form of life which is recognised as the divine. There is thus manifested in man a contrariety in his tendencies of life, which contrariety is not firmly rooted and aboriginal, but is testified to by experience, and depends on the isolation of *σὰρξ* and *πνεῦμα*, which strive one against the other instead of being united, that is, instead of the *σὰρξ* being pervaded and illuminated by the *πνεῦμα*. Thus, in Christ, as the Son of man, there existed both *σὰρξ* and also *πνεῦμα*, but not as forming a contrast to one another: in us, however, this contrast fully exists. When the *ψυχὴ* is made to describe the two together as a kind of middle term, it is sometimes understood as referring to the lower and sometimes to the higher life (Matt. xvi. 25; Mark viii. 35; Luke ix. 24, xvii. 33; John xii. 25). It is clear from these passages that the soul has both a lower and a higher sphere of life, and that whosoever is willing to surrender it in this lower sphere will save it in the higher, and will consequently actually gain it. It is, therefore, *a conscious individuality in a twofold sphere of life*. The lower aspect of the soul or its relation to material life is specially brought forward in Luke xii. 19, 20, the higher aspect in Matt. xvi. 26, Luke ix. 24; here, therefore, it is said that it will be *saved*, that is, for its higher destination. The tendency of the soul depends on the right element prevailing, and on its being actually animated by the *πνεῦμα* as the higher principle of life, by which alone it becomes inclined for higher blessings. But if the soul has

thoroughly entered the *σὰρξ*, as carnality, its spirituality is destroyed, and it needs a new birth (Luke xvii. 33). If it is *ζῶσα*, it is because the vital spirit has been breathed into it by the Creator (1 Cor. xv. 45), and it must be saved by being renewed, through Christ, by the Holy Ghost. Taking man in himself as a subject of accountableness, and as leading a life amenable to responsibility, the central focus and source-point of spiritual life in him is described by Jesus by the word *καρδία*. It is the representation of the *moral personality*, and therefore the origin of all moral defilement (Matt. xv. 18). It forms the *θησαυρός*, in which the man receives everything which is an object to him as if into the focus of his inner life where he makes it his spiritual property, and whence, as such, he again brings it forth (Luke vi. 45; Matt. xii. 35; Luke xxi. 34); but hence, anything which is really to be received by him into his personal life must be adopted into the heart, in order there to be assimilated to his individuality (Luke viii. 15). Man, therefore, can actually produce that which is good, only when it proceeds from the heart (Matt. xv. 8 ff.); his worship, if it is to be genuine, must come from the heart. Therefore, as the heart is, so is the man (Matt. xii. 35). The moral tendency is decided in the heart. In it a man is pure (Matt. v. 8), or the reverse (Matt. xv. 18) when the heart is overcharged with the excesses and cares of earth (Luke xxi. 34). From all this the fundamental conception becomes clear, resulting as it does from the two chief passages, Matt. xxvi. 41, and John iii. 6. The more the quickening element of the *πνεῦμα* is present in the *ψυχὴ*, the greater is the inclination to that which is good. So far, however, as the *ψυχὴ* has its existence in the *σῶμα*, it certainly quickens the *σὰρξ*, but at the same time its independent influence is done away with, and, desiring to rule instead of being ruled by the spirit, it falls entirely into the power of the *σὰρξ*. This is the contrast which is pointed out in Matt. xxvi. 41. In the disciples, however, the *πνεῦμα*, together with the *σὰρξ*, was still an active influence; yet even they, according to John iii. 6, were *flesh*. Not that the rational soul was wanting in the natural man, but the *σὰρξ* was pre-eminent in him. He is endowed with the *πνεῦμα*, but he is not *πνεῦμα*: this he can only be, that is, it can only become the active principle of his personal life, through the regeneration of the spirit.

Thus it is clear that, in the teaching of the Lord, those pas-

sages which in one aspect appear to deal with men as merely human beings, yet in another point of view lead us beyond the innate powers of man. As sin is deeply rooted in man, wherever man's dignity and destination are spoken of, the fact of the existence of sin in man's nature is also taken into account. We are thus led to another part of our subject,—

The teaching of Jesus as to the sins of men. The Old Testament expresses a consciousness of the dignity of man, which, from the very beginning, is derived from an idea of his similitude to the divine image, and is expressed in different ways by the idea of a covenant of God with man, made with individuals at first, but afterwards extending over the whole world; but, on the other hand, it also announces a deep consciousness of sin. Both ideas are the necessary result of the ethical character of the Old Testament religion, in contrast to the merely æsthetic features of the natural religion of the heathen. This mode of perception is, therefore, not peculiar to either one book or one period only, but, on the contrary, pervades the whole. At the very commencement of the Old Testament history, we have a moral fall of man, in which the entire development of the race became, on the one hand, a development of sin, but, on the other, through God's influence, a course of guidance following out a plan of salvation.

In conformity with this, the Old Testament distinctly expresses the fact of the universality of sin and its persistence in the world (Gen. vi. 5, 11–13, viii. 21; 1 Kings viii. 46; Ps. cxliii. 2; Job iv. 17–19; Prov. xx. 9). Passages like these give the result of the moral experience at particular periods; but the whole economy of the Old Testament tended generally to lead men to the acknowledgment of sin, especially by means of the law. In Gen. viii. 21, Ps. li. 7, lviii. 4, Isa. xlviii. 8, it is stated how deeply this sin is rooted, so that it is most difficult, or indeed impossible, to avoid it. Sin is not only existing *in fact*, but as an habitual *presence* in man. Towards the conclusion of prophecy (Ezek. xxxvi. 26, 27), the perception breaks forth that God must give a new heart if the people are to observe the hitherto neglected law and to live in the covenant; and this consciousness existed during the Babylonian captivity. Thus deep was the perception of sin in the Old Testament. Its nature was, however, recognised as disobedience to and rebellion from God, and as bringing with it the guilt which was implied by the idea of the law. The worship,

with all its institutions, pointed to the necessity of an atonement for sin. Prophecy revealed the whole course of the divine guidance, which directly tended to a development of moral consciousness. These were the elements which, together with the actual perception of it, must have revealed its nature.

Although the teaching of Jesus, on the one hand, attributes to man a dignity above the whole earthly creation, which dignity He grounds on the susceptibility of man for a communion with God, on the other hand, it recognises *man as sinful*, and, indeed, so very sinful, that *only through God's grace* can he be freed from the corruption of sin, and attain his destined end, which is eternal life.

The teaching of Jesus as to sin is usually very insufficiently treated of in biblical theology; and yet, by a somewhat more complete investigation, it will prove to be very abundant and profound, containing, indeed, the perfect germ of the apostolical development of the same subject. Jesus, if it is permissible so to speak, treated the matter less *ex professo*, than by connection with other things as occasion offered. The subject may be arranged under the two heads of the *nature* and the *universality of sin*.

(a) *The general idea of the nature of sin* is that of antagonism to God in mind and action. Hence it is called ἡ ἀνομία (Matt. vii. 23, xiii. 41), ἀνομία without the article (Matt. xxiii. 28), and also ἁμαρτία, and indeed ἡ ἁμαρτία as a generic idea (John viii. 34, xvi. 8), or likewise as existing in particular men (John viii. 21), and also as a designation of individual sins, without the article (Matt. xii. 31). Ἀνομία being antagonism to the law, ἁμαρτία is failing in its aim and deviations from its rule; hence ἁμαρτίαι is used for individual deviations (Luke xi. 4; Matt. ix. 2, 5 f.; John viii. 24, xx. 23; frequently in the phrase ἀφιέναι τὰς ἁμαρτίας). Another expression used for individual sins is παραπτώματα, individual transgressions of the divine law (Matt. vi. 14 f.; Mark xi. 25 f.); lastly, ὀφειλήματα (Matt. vi. 12), *debts*, inasmuch as sin generally and every separate sin is a debt as regards man, in virtue of which he is punishable, and an obligation is laid upon him to satisfy and discharge God's will. Sin, therefore, is represented under the figure of a debt, which, if it is not forgiven, must be paid in full (Matt. v. 26, xviii. 23–35). Man as a sinner, he in whom sin habitually dwells, is ἁμαρτωλός (Luke v. 32; Matt. ix. 13), in contrast to δίκαιος; or, inasmuch as he persistently commits sin, he is called ὁ ἐργαζόμενος τὴν

ἁνομίαν (Matt. vii. 23). *The idea of sin* in the teaching of Jesus is in harmony with this phraseology and His interpretations thereof. It is opposition to the νόμος in thought, word, and action, and thus an opposition to God's will. The condition of sin is, therefore, following the Old Testament view, a condition of alienation from God. Jesus has depicted it in its two principal developments in the eloquent and profound parable of the prodigal son (Luke xv. 11 ff.). In the first place, sin is manifested only in the younger son,—an alienation from God, increasing co-equally with a desire for a false independence,—and he himself comprises the whole of his earlier life in his confession. But subsequently an opposition to the will of his father is shown in the elder son also, although outwardly he had remained with him. Because sin is alienation from God, its *chief point consists in want of faith in Christ*; for in the New Testament God has revealed Himself and drawn near to man *in Christ*. Thus the statement (John xvi. 8) that the Holy Ghost will convict the world of sin is based on the unbelief of the world in Christ. In this all antagonism to God is concentrated, and becomes positive in its hatred to God. The negative view, that man does not serve God, but only the world and his own self, is but a mere superficial appearance. If man serves the world, he must in fact hate God, for God and the world are essentially opposed. In this, however, God is understood in a general point of view, as is the case for the most part in the Sermon on the Mount, and apart from His special revelation in Christ. In John xv. 23, 24, the two ideas are combined.

The antagonism to God which is implied in the nature of sin is also *carnality* or *the flesh* (John iii. 6). This finds its moving cause and seat in the σάρξ, the latter forming the contrast to the πνεῦμα. From the *flesh* arise those desires which are directed towards the things of this lower life,—ἐπιθυμίαι (Mark iv. 19; Luke viii. 14), referring to the interests of this world and the deceptive allurements of earthly pleasures, by which the heart is clogged and drawn down. He who devotes himself to these is alienated from God, and he who is alienated from God devotes himself to these. The self-surrender is consummated in the two tendencies of the nature opposed to God: first, the repugnance to higher and better things, and the renunciation of them; next, the actual opposition or enmity to God. These two characteristics are the cause of *sin* being described as *devilish* (John viii. 44,

40 f.), also as *lies* and *hatred*. Hence result the two fundamental forms of sin, the *open* and the *concealed alienation from God*, as exemplified by Jesus in the two sons in His parable of the prodigal son, and as was shown by the contrast between publicans and sinners on the one hand, and Pharisees on the other.

The teaching of Jesus, therefore, intensifies the Old Testament conception of sin only so far as it brings forward more distinctly its *positive nature*, and, because the revelation of God was then consummated, considers that sin is completed in opposition to this revelation, consequently in a want of faith in Christ, and, lastly, in the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost.

It is, besides, peculiar to Jesus' teaching, that He with peculiar emphasis, in both classes of sin, recognises sin in its *internal character*,—that sin defiles a man from within, and is in the first place something inward, which is rooted in and native to the inmost recesses of the personality (Matt. xv. 11, 15–20). It is thus represented in the Sermon on the Mount, and subsequently in the discourse against the Pharisees. Wrath forms the inward element in the infraction of the command, Thou shalt not kill. The inward sin is so much the main point, that, compared with it, the greatness or smallness of the outward deed is scarcely a matter of importance. For this very reason *words* become so significant as a disclosure of the inward feelings (Matt. xii. 24), and of the whole character, according to which the fruit of the life is shaped (Matt. xii. 33, 35, under the figure of a fruit-tree and a treasure). Hence an *organic, lively view of human morality* is most decidedly brought forward, in contrast to any mechanical and lifeless view which would make individual action a matter of opinion. Even in the Old Testament system the principle was recognised, that every man must be judged according to his heart; but Christ, in opposition to all pharisaical deteriorations of this principle, inculcated it anew, and consistently imbued with it the whole of His teaching.

With the inward character of sin its *guilt* and *liability to punishment* are closely connected. For the more strictly sin is understood as being of an inward nature, the more it comprehends the individual causality, and places the man in a position of liability; as an arbitrary infringement of the relation of obligation to God's will, it brings about the necessity for satisfaction. The guilt is manifested by sin degrading the man: first, it deprives

him of his original dignity, which is based on his relation to God (Matt. xv. 11), then of the dignity of his sonship in God's house (Luke xv. 18, 19), and the fellowship with Christ, and with God in Him (Matt. x. 37, 38). This self-degradation, as guilt includes also the liability to punishment, *ἐνοχος* = the "being in danger" (Matt. v. 22). Hence an account is required of the sinner (Luke xvi. 2), especially in the day of judgment (Matt. xii. 36). He must give satisfaction (Matt. xviii. 25-35). Both guilt and liability to punishment are, however, subject to a graduated modification, as also is sin itself (Luke xii. 47; John xv. 22, ix. 41). Man is, indeed, guilty even where he is deficient in knowledge; but where knowledge exists, the guilt thereby becomes greater. With sin *evil* is inseparably bound up. In a world in which all life, all good things, and the entire ordering of affairs are from God, the effect of sin (as antagonism to God) must necessarily be that a complete dissolution of life (which is from God) should ensue. Light and life, which are from Him, must dwindle away in proportion to the presence of sin. Consequently it is in *evil* that the unworthiness and antagonism to God, which are inherent in sin, are chiefly manifested; and the condition of sin is death, darkness, and a lost state (John xii. 46, iii. 19, viii. 12; cf. Luke xxii. 53). *Death* is to be understood, in the first place, not in a merely physical sense, but as a general process of dissolution: it is usually represented as of a more comparative and partial character. These partial phenomena are confronted by the idea of death in all its fulness and absoluteness; but the former are part of a process which is always tending to this completion, unless some other direction is given by means of new light and new life. This comprehensive idea of death is especially characteristic of the discourses in St. John's Gospel; cf. ch. v. 21 with the antithesis of the *ζωοποιεῖν* as the work of the Son. The *νεκροὶ* are to be understood here as referring to both ideas. The *μὴ ἀποθανεῖν*, as the deliverance from death, is therefore a fact now opposing itself to the process of death which is already commenced; cf. vi. 50, xi. 26. But we find this full idea of death in the synoptical passages also, as in the language describing the condition of the prodigal son in his alienation from God (Luke xv. 32). The mention of "the dead" in Matt. viii. 22, Luke vi. 60, is also thus to be understood. The physically dead are to be buried by the spiritually dead, who are good for nothing

else ; but he who is destined for the kingdom of God is to preach it. The *being lost*, or *perishing*, is an idea of the same character (Luke xix. 10 ; cf. John iii. 16) ; for it forms the contrast to *ζωὴ αἰώνιος*, as also does *ἀπώλεια* (Matt. vii. 13). In this idea the view presupposed in the Old Testament is also included, that bodily death is the result of sin, and on this account a deliverance from sin is also essentially a deliverance from death, and a raising from the dead is also understood. Christ is for us not only the life generally, but also specially the resurrection (John xi. 25, 26, vi. 39 f., 44, 54). This idea pervades the whole of His history and teaching. Material death is only one item in the process of the dissolution of life by means of sin. As the link between God and the sinner is loosed, so also is the connection with personal life loosed by alienation from its true source.

As we have already seen with regard to the inward nature of sin, it is peculiar to the teaching of Jesus that sin is not to be understood as merely actual evil-doing. It is, on the contrary, a *condition, an habitual bent or proneness*, which is merely brought to light in actual sin. This is implied in the comparison of man to a good or bad tree (Matt. xii. 33–35 ; Luke vi. 43 ; Matt. vii. 17, 18). Jesus had addressed to the Pharisees words full of warning, and He explains them by showing that neither word nor deed is to be taken by itself, but always in relation to the context and circumstances ; wherefore also a single word may disclose a deep abyss of sin. Sin, as a condition, is also set forth by the comparison of the sinner to a sick man, who needs the physician (Matt. ix. 12). Jesus also speaks as to the *relation between the proneness and actual sin itself* (John viii. 34). Every sin, in that it proceeds from the proneness, strengthens the latter and increases it. It is not merely an action, it becomes a power which masters the man and holds him in its fetters : the outward operation of the *ἐπιθυμία* increases its power. This power is presupposed by the Lord when He speaks of Himself as a deliverer, and says that He would set free. He goes back to the original root of the matter in John iii. 6, in which He states the existence of a carnal, *i.e.* a sinful condition, which is caused by the natural birth. Consequently *the propensity of man to sin is given to him in his natural birth, as if in his very nature*,—a doctrine which is much developed by the Apostle Paul. In every place, however, even where it is not expressly set forth in a didactic mode, this

natural condition is presupposed as one needing deliverance. But even here there is a limitation. There is, indeed, a sin (Matt. xii. 31) which cannot be forgiven. This, however, leads us back to the idea that *perfected sin is the opposition to redemption on the part of unbelief*: sin severs itself from the redeeming operation of God. The Lord's warning refers, in the first place, to the utterance by which the Pharisees had sought to do away with the powerful impression made on the bystanders at the casting out of devils. In their language they had not yet committed this sin, but they were on the road which would lead them to this bewildering pinnacle of wickedness. The language, therefore, must neither be arbitrarily extended in its application, nor yet be limited to this single action; for both word and action stand in organic connection with the state of the heart, which is thereby revealed (vers. 31, 32, 33, 35), and for this very reason an account must be given for every word. The blasphemy against the Holy Ghost is ranked so much above that against the Son, because the latter sin, looking at the manifold historical misapprehensions which might be possible as to any particular subject, may be comparatively excusable; whilst the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, which can only ensue after the latter has inwardly manifested Himself, is the most conscious of all sins (and really satanic),—it is the exact opposite to the sin for the perpetrators of which the Lord prayed upon the cross. The Lord does not say whether it had been committed by men, yet in the development of the teaching of the New Testament we come to points where it can scarcely be considered as not actually existing. It is also elsewhere expressed how sin is perfected through consciousness and perseverance (Matt. xi. 20–24). Of this kind, too, are all the lamentations of Jesus as to the unbelief of His contemporaries, especially of the chief men of the people (John xvi. 8, xv. 22). The blasphemy against the Holy Ghost is to be considered as the very culminating point of unbelief in the Father and in Him (Matt. xii. 31; Luke xii. 10; Mark iii. 28).

The *universality of sin* naturally results from the fact that the proneness to it, which constitutes its essence, forms a part of human nature. In the Old Testament the universality of sin was recognised in the confession that we need a new heart; and in the New Testament teaching, especially in that of Jesus, the doctrine is still more developed in connection with the truth of

the redemption. It is brought forward most forcibly in John iii. 3-8, where it is said comprehensively that except he be born again, no one can enter the kingdom of God.

In this respect the two explanatory conversations, with Nicodemus in John iii., and with the rich young man in Matt. xix., are most significant. In both conversations Jesus enters into the question as to what was to be done in order to enter into the kingdom of God, or to attain eternal life. In both cases He gives essentially the same answer,—to one a direct, and to the other an indirect reply, according to the individuality of each man. With the circumspect but confident Nicodemus, He had to adopt a similar but somewhat different course from that which He followed with the youthful rashness of the earnest and enthusiastic young man, who, even in early life, was a ruler of the synagogue. Urged by an honourable impulse to desire that which was good, and not content to rest satisfied with the ordinary measure of righteousness, he had come to the Lord to learn surely and perfectly from Him, as the “good Master,” what he should do to inherit eternal life. The one is quite certain that he cannot fail in possessing eternal life; the other, that he will be able to do everything necessary for its attainment. With both, the upshot of the matter was, to lead them to a true knowledge of life, and, by means of moral humiliation, to make them willing to submit themselves to the Lord’s guidance, and so to follow the right path. For this reason the conversation with both was shaped so as to lead them to a confession of sin, and especially to make them conscious of its universality; for both considered themselves to be men who, in a moral point of view, formed exceptions to the general rule, or, at least, were among the best of all. Jesus was therefore compelled to speak quite generally. No one is good but God alone; and when doing good is the matter in question, reliance can be placed on but one thing alone. That which is impossible with man is possible with God, and through Him (Matt. xix. 26; Mark x. 27; Luke xviii. 27). The young man was in the wrong path when he looked upon Jesus as a human teacher, and yet addressed Him as the “good Master.” No man is good—every one must first become so; and this can only be done through the power and grace of God. This is the real application of the discourse, which consequently says much the same as the Lord’s elucidation to Nicodemus. And the general proposition

forms the groundwork for the special test of self-knowledge which Jesus (Matt. xix. 21) applies to the rich young man.

But this proposition of the universality of sin may also be inferred from the Lord's teaching on other occasions, especially where He speaks of His work. On the one hand, He describes His work as intended *for all men* (John xvii. 2, iii. 16; Matt. xiii. 38); on the other, He says that He had come to save *that which was lost*. In His eyes, therefore, *all must be lost*, without special help; and the only requisite for partaking in the benefits of His work is, that *men should confess themselves to be sick, or sinners*. But, in respect to this decided assertion and thorough presupposition of the universal necessity for redemption, it must not be overlooked that Jesus, just as the entire Old and New Testaments, makes a moral distinction, without regard, indeed, to the redemption: there are both *righteous* and *wicked*. This is shown by a retrospect of the Old Testament history, by a glance, indeed, at the heathen world, when Jesus lovingly seeks (Matt. xii. 42) to humiliate the Jewish assumption of righteousness by honourable mention of heathen examples, drawn from the Old Testament history. He even refers back to the primitive records, in speaking of the righteous Abel (Matt. xxiii. 35).

§ 28. *The Object of Redemption—the World, in its connection with the Prince of this World.*

From the figure of the bad tree, which threw out branches in every direction, and might be rich in fruit, it may be inferred that Jesus regarded sin as not merely consisting in individual actions, but as an organic unity in every individual; but, before all acts of sin, the proneness thereto exists in man as *ἐκ σαρκὸς γεγεννημένος*. In a similar way He considers the sin of individuals as not separated from that of the remainder of mankind, but by no means in the sense that each one will not have to give an account for himself. On the contrary, in every individual his whole moral conduct remains the object of his personal responsibility (Matt. xii. 36, 37). But, on the other hand, *sin* is a state of life common to all, owing to the identity of human nature in all, inasmuch as they are born of the flesh (John iii. 6). In consequence of their *natural birth* they are *flesh*, and so far not susceptible of the spiritual kingdom of God. This community of sinful life is therefore entailed on the natural deriva-

tion. But this social community in sin is also assisted by the *mutual influence of men* on one another. In the world "it must needs be that offences come" (Matt. xviii. 7). This is said under the supposition that sin actually and necessarily exists in the world; and it necessarily results that a man by sinning must afford to others an occasion and an incitement to sin. Thus an excellent beginning in good things may be hindered and even destroyed (Matt. xviii. 6); and on this account human society is sometimes to be lamented over and sometimes is culpable (*οὐαί*), inasmuch as this growing influence of sin is bound up with guilt and corruption. But the individual man is also to be lamented over if he give occasion of offence, as, by the exercise of this influence, his guilt and liability to punishment are increased (ver. 6), and he himself must always tend to become worse. Every one, therefore, is enjoined both to exercise the utmost strictness in the subjugation of his own sinful desires (vers. 8, 9), and also to use the greatest care in the case of those who might readily take offence (ver. 10; Mark ix. 42; Luke xvii. 1, 2; cf. Matt. v. 29, 30). By means of this independent mutual influence, that which is good may be also effectively propagated; but, looking at the universality of sin, it becomes a question whence the requisite good should come (Mark ix. 50; Luke xiv. 34; Matt. v. 13). The salt has, in fact, become useless, and has lost its power. Unless some entirely different organic system is communicated from without, or rather from above, no deliverance from sin can proceed from this community of life, taken by itself. There is, on the contrary, a constant circulation of sin, first kindling and then consummating its wicked propensities.

This community of life is styled by our Lord *the world* (*κόσμος*). The idea occurs sometimes in a narrower signification, and sometimes in a wider one, and is therefore found with various closer definitions. In the first place, the *κόσμος* is the *universe* (John xvii. 5, 24), where the creation is spoken of as the founding of the world; likewise also, perhaps, in Matt. xvi. 26, "For what is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?" Next, it is the *world of men*,—humanity in its whole extent (Matt. xiii. 38; John iii. 16; Mark xiv. 9, xvi. 15); then a still closer definition, *the earthly order of things* being specially brought forward (John xvi. 21, 28, as to the birth of the Son of man and of men generally); also,

referring to the men living upon earth, τὸν κόσμον τοῦτον (John ix. 39). It is also the world of men, as subject to the earthly order of things in contrast with God, inasmuch as in it, and also in creation generally, sin prevails (Matt. xviii. 7, v. 14; John vii. 7, xiv. 17, 22, xvi. 20, 33, xvii. 9, 16, 25, xii. 47, vi. 33, xii. 31, cf. xvi. 11, xiv. 30). This sinful world thus forms a contrast to those who follow God—devout believers—inasmuch as they are chosen out of the world (John xv. 19), and are not of it (John xv. 19, xvii. 14, 16). The κόσμος is the whole body of those living in sin upon the earth, without being restricted to those cases in which sin has increased into a power approaching enormity. This established condition must be broken through if it is to be in any way overcome.

In considering the *sinful community of living as a whole*, Jesus does not overlook its *diversity*, resulting from differences of ages, nationalities, and individuals. This is evident from the way in which, in a moral point of view, He judges men with whom He was not in immediate contact, as in Matt. xiii., where He distinguishes four classes of conduct in respect of God's word, or Matt. xxi. 31, where He awards the kingdom of heaven to the publicans in preference to the Pharisees. He also recognises the *diversities of nationalities*, by pointing out the sin of the Gentiles (Matt. vi. 32) to be a misunderstanding of God and a surrender to the world. The Lord specially pointed to the national feeling of the Jews, their self-exaltation in the consciousness of the divine law and the theocratic guidance, combined with their opposition thereto, as the sin of His Jewish contemporaries, "of this γενεά" (Matt. xii. 38-45, xvi. 1-4). The people, as a body, were at that time perverted and unfaithful to their covenant God; they were refractory against God and His revealed will. However stringent might be the summons of divine mercy, they were childish self-willed (Matt. xi. 15-19). The synoptical gospels are rich in expressions of this kind; but there are some of a similar character in John (v. 37-47, viii. 37). Amid this general and comprehensive perception of the moral feelings of His contemporaries, we find Jesus especially characterizing the pharisaical spirit as hypocrisy (Matt. vi. 5, xv., and xxiii.; Luke xviii. 9; cf. John x. 8).

In carrying the idea of sin beyond the bounds of humanity, and assuming a supernatural being to stand in causative relation to

human sin, the teaching of Jesus is not absolutely new as contrasted with the *Old Covenant*. The Mosaic record of the fall (Gen. iii.) evidently points to sin which preceded that of man. Human sin does not appear as of a primitive character, but as induced by sin in another quarter. Satan, therefore, presents himself, but not as yet in the same direct way as subsequently (Job i. 6–12, ii. 1–7); also as a hostile spirit (Zech. iii. 1, 2). We likewise find destroying angels and demons mentioned as being the objects of heathen worship (Deut. xxxii. 17; Lev. xvii. 7; Ps. cvi. 37). The general idea of the possibility of a sinful development of the spirit-world had long existed (Job iv. 18, xv. 14). The progress of these ideas is, however, but gradual, because, before all things, it was requisite to keep the people free from any danger of idolatry, and devoted to the one God. The nearer the work of redemption approached maturity, the more necessary it became that the world of evil should be unveiled; and this was the case from the Babylonian captivity down to the time of Christ, in which latter period darkness itself came into open conflict with the light. A similar development of this kind is also prophesied during the second appearance of the Lord. It is thus evident how superficial that view is which attributes this progress of ideas to the influence of foreign nations.

Jesus therefore *presupposes the belief in Satan* as a thing long familiar to His contemporaries, not, indeed, as an erroneous notion, but as something actually true. In Matt. xiii. 19, 38, and perhaps also in ch. vi. 13, He calls him *ὁ πονηρός*. This appellation alternates with that of *Σατανᾶς* (Mark iv. 15) and *διάβολος* (Luke viii. 12; Matt. xiii. 39), also *ἐχθρός* (the enemy of God) (Luke x. 19). Of similar signification is the proper name *Βεελζεβοὺλ* (or rather *Βεελζεβοὺβ*) = *dominus stercoris*, the remodelled name of the god of the Philistines, which the Jews ascribed to Satan (Matt. xii. 24, 27; Mark iii. 22; Luke xi. 15, 18; Matt. x. 25). The designation *ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου* (John xii. 31, xiv. 30, xvi. 11) is also characteristic; cf. the *θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου* (2 Cor. iv. 4). The Lord describes Satan as the originator and the father of human sin,—as a being standing in a primitive and causative relation to it. Thus most pregnantly, John viii. 44. In opposition to the Jews, who had so pertinaciously decided against Him that they sought to kill Him, He says that their animosity against Him did not proceed from a

feeling that His works and teaching were not of a righteous kind, but because they were in manifest moral antagonism to their God (ver 40). That God was not their Father, as they said (ver. 42), else would they love Him (Jesus), for He had proceeded forth from God, and had come into the world. But so far were they from loving Him, that they were unable to understand His speech, and could not endure it (ver. 43). Therefore God was not their Father; but He would tell them, judging by their mode of thought and action, who their father was. He thus points out to them to whom they have apostatized, and from whom their apostasy derives its origin. He then brings forward two elements in the *διάβολος*, that He was a murderer and a liar, and abode not in the truth, and that consequently now there is no truth in him, he himself being a liar and the father of lies (it is by no means implied by this that he was originally wicked, but, on the contrary, that the highest created spirit has not the truth *absolutely* in himself, but must abide or maintain himself in it; from which it plainly follows that he fell away to lies through his own agency). He has *alienated himself from the truth which is of God, and has opposed himself to it*, and thereby also to life, which is also of God. He is therefore a propagator of *θάνατος*, the dissolution of life, destruction or death, and this, indeed, from the beginning—*ἀπ' ἀρχῆς*. This beginning does not apply to his life, but to the commencement of the history of man (cf. Matt. xix. 8). It is a matter of doubt whether the fall of man or Cain's deed is here alluded to. Even if, as in 1 John iii. 12, the latter is intended (the Lord doubtless mentioned murder on account of the murderous plot of the Jews against Him), the deeper sense applies to the fall of Adam, and the advent of death among the race of man; so that the causative connection with human sin is therein implied. Cain's fratricide was only the immediate continuation of the first sin, and in him was manifested one element of Satan's agency, just as in the fall another was exhibited, viz. deceit and fraud, which opened the path for sin.

In this causative relation to human sin Satan appears (Matt. xiii. 19, 38, 39) in the two parables, one as to the fourfold sowing in the arable field, and the other as to the enemy who sowed tares among the wheat. In the first, it is Satan who took away the scattered seed out of the hearts of one section of men, so that they could not retain the divine word from which the divine life

was to spring up in them, and consequently could not be saved; in the other parable, the tares denote wicked men who persistently oppose the divine word. Here also, as before, in the explanation, and not in the parable itself, He refers the moral opposition to the influence of Satan, who, as the enemy, sowed the tares; the latter are the *υἱοὶ τοῦ πονηροῦ*. Satan's agency extends even to the *βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ*, for these *υἱοὶ τοῦ πονηροῦ* exist in such intimate community of life with the children of the kingdom, that they cannot be rooted out without endangering the latter also. It specially, therefore, follows from this, that the causative agency of Satan in promoting sin exists simultaneously with the operation of the divine word and the divine plan of salvation. This is a speaking testimony against the oft-expressed rationalistic view, that the Lord asserted that satanic agency came to an end with His appearance. This influence is, however, not invincible. It can be withstood by moral means, as is evident from Luke xxii. 31 (cf. vers. 32 and 46). Jesus particularly reminds His disciples that, just at that decisive epoch, at the end of their discipleship, and looking forward to His own death, they would be exposed to specially powerful influence on the part of Satan. He subsequently declares that this time of temptation is already entered on.

It likewise follows from the teaching of Jesus, *that Satan has a kingdom*, a wide-spreading sphere of action,—a kingdom, indeed, diversified with gradations of ranks and members, in which he rules (Matt. xii. 24–26, 45); he has his angels (Matt. xxv. 41). As the ruler of this kingdom, he is the *ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου*, inasmuch as the world lies in wickedness and under the curse of sin, by virtue of the universality of the latter. Mankind thus forms a part of the kingdom of Satan in the fast-entwined complication of sin and corruption. Because the Son entered into this world in order to release it from this entanglement, He has to deal as a combatant with Satan and his kingdom; and the personal contest is brought before us in the history of the temptation (Matt. iv.). This history does not, indeed, immediately belong to the teaching of the Lord, but it is, at all events, indirectly referred to in His statements. Matt. xvi. 23 is an echo of this temptation. In John xiv. 30 He alludes to His victory, and in John vi. 70 to His conflict (cf. Luke xxii. 3, 53). The whole world of men, banded against Jesus, form a part of the power of darkness; but for this very reason the prince of this

world is judged and condemned by His work (John xvi. 11). But, notwithstanding this decision, a continuous course of opposition to the work of Christ pervades the whole realization of redemption (Matt. xiii.; Luke xxii.).

Another *peculiar element of satanic agency* must, however, be alluded to. Jesus does not go so far as to afford us any instruction on this subject, but still He so often spoke as to a certain physical and psychical influence of Satan which to some extent overstepped the immediately visible, and placed this subject in so practical a relation to the kingdom of God which He announced, that it must necessarily be considered as forming a part of His teaching. It was a well-known fact that, at the time of our Lord, the Jewish people attributed certain bodily and mental sufferings to the influence of demons: this was the so-called *possession by devils*. The *δαιμονιζόμενοι* were not those morally subdued by Satan (as to whom the Lord expresses Himself quite differently, Luke xxii. 3; John xiii. 2), but those who were suffering both in body and mind (Luke viii. 27), who had a *πνεῦμα δαιμ. ἀκαθάρτου* (Luke iv. 33, vi. 18). A woman also is spoken of who had a *πνεῦμα ἀσθενείας*, a spirit which caused the infirmity (Luke xiii. 11, cf. 16). Some of them were called *lunatics* (Matt iv. 24, xvii. 15), their malady being supposed to have some connection with the changes of the moon. The Evangelist John, who does not relate any healing of demoniacs, was familiar with the *δαιμόνιον ἔχειν* (cf. vii. 20, viii. 48-52, x. 20). It is related of Jesus that He healed many possessed with devils. Sometimes it is told but briefly (Matt. iv. 24; Mark i. 34; Matt. viii. 16; Mark i. 39, iii. 11, 12; Luke vi. 18), sometimes with detailed descriptions and representations of the facts. We are also told that Jesus communicated to His disciples the power to cast out devils (Mark iii. 15; Luke ix. 1), and that they henceforth did it (Mark vi. 13; Luke x. 17); although in one case the attempt of the disciples was in vain, whereupon the Lord, recognising their unbelief as the cause of their failure, with one word accomplished the cure (cf. Matt. xvii. 14-21). On this occasion, and also in several other cases, He expressly explains Himself on this subject (Matt. xii. 43-45), comparing the only temporary cure of a demoniac with the mental indecision of His contemporaries, who, in spite of the most urgent calls, maintained as a body the utmost indifference towards the

Lord, and the might of God's impending kingdom. This explanation, in conjunction with the commission and power of healing conferred on the disciples, renders it perfectly clear how earnestly the Lord desired that His disciples should believe that *these evils were to be attributed to Satanic influences*. The mode, too, in which He (and all Holy Scripture with Him) understands sin, and defines the relation of Satan and his kingdom to sin, and, further, the relation of sin to evil, and to the disturbance and dissolution of life (*death* in its most diversified sense), completely correspond with the Lord's teaching as to the connection of these maladies, partly with sin and evil generally, and partly with Satan. The *physical sufferings* which principally showed themselves in these men were sometimes spasms and convulsions (Mark i. 23, 26; Luke iv. 33, 35), especially epilepsy (Matt. xvii. 14), sometimes dumbness (Luke xi. 14; Matt. ix. 32), or both dumbness and blindness together (Matt. xii. 22), and sometimes, at least once, paralytic deformity (Luke xiii. 11). In several cases manifest *mental disturbances* were combined with these physical sufferings. In the instance of the man afflicted with spasms and convulsions there was an interruption of self-consciousness; and in the Gadarene demoniac the malady had generally the appearance of raving insanity (Matt. viii. 28; cf. Mark v. 1; Luke viii. 26-39). Whether mental disturbances were combined with the physical malady in other cases is not evident from the accounts given, although it is probable, because the declaration of the demoniacal influence may thus be most readily understood. Both Greeks and Romans shared these ideas (epilepsy was the *morbus sacer*). The statements of Hippocrates also agree with this, in which he speaks of the connection between epilepsy and mental aberration as a peculiar species of imbecility. The very varied kinds of *δαιμονιζόμενοι* were thus outwardly indicated. The Lord, however, everywhere speaks in essentially the same way as to the *invisible cause*. Rationalism seeks to attribute these utterances to a giving way on the part of Jesus to prevalent ideas. But any accommodation to erroneous opinions, any positive yielding to them which would amount to an approval and confirmation of them, is, in the view of any impartial person, a tendency very far removed from the character of our Lord, as manifested in His mode of action. In everything He desired to point out the path, and not to follow others; and in every case,

when truth and falsehood were in question, He was wont to express Himself frankly, even when most in opposition to the mightiest among the people,—always, however, with that didactic wisdom which befitted the Man and the Son of God, but always, too, with the veracity which put aside everything which favoured error and falsehood. Although here and there, in the wisdom of His teaching, He seemed to shun controversy, yet this was always so done that the error and delusion which were the matters in question were on His part always fully exposed, although perhaps at first in an indirect mode. It was very different in respect to the ideas we are considering. He did nothing to put an end to the existence of the doctrine derived from the Old Testament as to Satan, the Satanic kingdom, etc., as *e.g.* He must necessarily have done (if it were erroneous) in the case recorded in Matt. xvii. 14. Against this view not even a single inference which can stand its ground can be derived from the whole of His teaching as to God and man, sin and grace. Not only, however, has He said nothing whatever against these ideas, but, on the contrary, which, too, is the main point, He has so spoken and taught, that we must admit them among the body of His teaching, especially the theory of this physical and psychical influence of demons. He expressly stated that the casting out of devils was a conquest of Satan by One stronger than he (Matt. xii. 22 ff.; Mark iii. 23 ff.; Luke xi. 21 ff.), and that it was as it were an actual proof that, with the arrival of this stronger One, the kingdom of God had come into the kingdom in which the strong one had before ruled. He speaks similarly (Luke xiii. 10–17) of the loosing of the bonds of Satan as an action arising from His humane love. It is evident here, just as in the conferring of the power of healing on His disciples, that He connects this destruction of Satan's work with His own work of redemption, and Satan himself, as the prince of this world, with man's sin and need of redemption.

In this very teaching *man's complete need of redemption* fully presents itself. Man can only be set free by the power and grace of God. The Scriptures do *not* say that Satan is included in the sphere of redemption; on the contrary, the Lord speaks of an *everlasting fire* prepared for him and his ἀγγέλους (Matt. xxv. 41). No scheme of redemption for these fallen creatures is anywhere spoken of; but we may perceive an enormous extent of long-sufferance exercised towards them during the whole course

of man's history. At the last judgment Satan's trial will come to an end, but it is not anywhere stated that the work of redemption avails for him. There is, on the contrary, afforded us, even as regards men, a glance into the abyss of sin, by which we see that sin may attain to such a pitch that for it there is *no forgiveness either in this or the future αἰὼν*. At this point man's sin is allied to Satan's not merely in its similarity, but in its essence. This constitutes the lapse into the sin against the Holy Ghost (Matt. xii. 31, 32).

§ 29. *The Subject of Redemption—Redeeming Power.*

From the doctrine of the universality of sin in mankind, we have, in the first place, only the negative result, that redeeming power does not exist in man. As regards the *positive* side, we perceive that the Lord points out *God generally*, and especially *God's love* as the redeeming principle; but in doing this He always represents Himself, the Son of God, as the real *Redeemer*, by whose interposition redemption is completed. He refers the redemption to *God generally*, first in synoptical passages, especially in parables, in which redemption is represented as being founded on God, God's will, and particularly God's pity (Matt. xviii. 12-14). It is not the will of God that any one should be lost; just as a good shepherd, if but one of his hundred sheep be lost, will not suffer it to go astray. On the contrary, he makes this lost one the exclusive object of his care and trouble, the successful result of which is his greatest joy. Thus it is not the will of the heavenly Father that one of these little ones should perish: cf. ver. 10, in reference to the children vers. 1, 2. Likewise in the parable of the creditor (Matt. xviii. 27 ff.), and in the concluding sentence of the account of the rich young man (Matt. xix. 26). In these and several other passages, it is therefore God to whom the deliverance from the corruption of sin and man's introduction into the kingdom of God are simply and generally attributed. But although in these passages the merciful God is represented as the general principle of redemption, the more definite idea is not excluded, which presents itself in other utterances, as in the parables in which Jesus points out His own interposition (cf. Matt. xxii. 2 ff.; Luke xx. 9-18; Matt. xxv. 1-13, as to the marriage-feast, the vineyard, and the virgins). So also in the passages in St. John's Gospel (ch. vi. 38-40, iv. 34), which

attribute redemption to the will of the Father, but still with essential reference to the interposition of the Son,—the only-begotten Son being generally represented as the direct and original object of the love of the Father, this beatifying love being transmitted from the Son to believers, and diffused among them (John iii. 16, xiv. 23, xvii. 26, v. 20). In harmony with this is the heavenly approbation manifested at Jesus' baptism and glorification (Matt. iii. 17, xvii. 5). His teaching as to the will of the Father being the groundwork of the redemption which is effected through the Son, follows also from a comparison of the *εὐδοκία* in the above-named passages and in Matt. xi. 26, with the *θέλημα* in ch. xviii. 14.

According to the united statements of the evangelists, Jesus *expressly declares Himself to be the Redeemer*, the entire purport of their narratives affording the proof that He looked upon His own person as the centre round which everything moved, and on which everything depended. In the three first evangelists, in whom the idea of God's kingdom prevails, He places His own person in essential relation to this kingdom; and, as the nature of the former is represented as being distinctly stamped by His *miracles*, its importance is made evident by the requirement of *faith in Him* as the condition of this miraculous help. In John, where the positive idea of redemption, and particularly that of the *ζωή* prevails, the Lord describes Himself as *the Life* and the *Giver of it*.

The utterances in which Jesus designates Himself as the Messiah will be further considered in § 30. We will here mention some passages from the synoptical discourses, in which the idea of the redemption specially presents itself. Among these is Matt. ix. 12, 13, in which Jesus says that He was the physician for the spiritually sick, and that He had come to call sinners to repentance; also (Luke xix. 10; Matt. xviii. 11; Luke v. 32) that He had come to seek and to save that which was lost. Likewise (Matt. xx. 28) that He had not come to be ministered unto, but to minister,—indeed, to give His life as a ransom, as the price for the deliverance of many from sin and its corruption. He therefore sheds His blood for the remission of sins, in which is afforded the most important idea of redemption. In Luke xxiv. 46, 47, He it is in whose name alone repentance and remission of sins can and must be preached to all nations.

In Matt. xi. 28 He it is who gives comfort and rest to all the spiritually distressed and miserable, if, indeed, they take upon them *His* yoke; and, inasmuch as He is the Son to whom the Father has committed everything, no one can know the Father but he to whom the Son has revealed Him (ver. 27). True spiritual communion with the Father, comfort and rest to the soul, are all therefore brought about through the Son, to whom (Matt. xxviii. 18–20) is given all power in heaven and earth for the salvation of men. Thus forcibly, in the synoptical discourses, does Jesus declare that it is He through whom the redemption of man is effected; and this representation of Himself, and the proof of it, appear in the synoptical gospels as the aim of the Lord in His discourses, and as the work which He describes as committed to Him. The case is the same in the *Gospel of St. John*, which contains many pregnant declarations as to the aim and end of His appearance upon earth, and as to His *work*. Thus, in John iii. 16, 17, it is the aim and end of His mission (on which the entry into the kingdom of God depends) *to save from the corruption of sin*, and *to communicate the ζῶν αἰώνιος through faith in Him*. It is through faith in Him that man hath passed from death unto life. In ch. vi., with respect to the aim of His appearance, He represents Himself as the bread of life which had come down from heaven, and as the Giver of eternal life (ver. 27); and that, consequently, at the last day, the resurrection should be given through faith in Him, who had come down from heaven, and had afforded His flesh and blood for the salvation and life of the world (ver. 51–58). According to John viii. 12, He is the Light of the world, which affords quickening light to all that believe in Him: it is He alone who can rightly set free from sin (vers. 31–37), through faith in Him who is without sin (vers. 45, 46). According to ch. x., He is the good Shepherd who gives true life and the fulness thereof to the sheep which hear His voice (ver. 10), and for this purpose voluntarily lays down His life. In ch. xi. He is Himself the Resurrection and the Life, and he that believeth on Him is superior to death (vers. 25, 26). According to ch. xii. 24, 32, the Son of man, in order to bring forth much fruit, and to draw all men to Himself, must fall like a corn of wheat to the earth. In ch. xiv. 6, He it is through whom alone man cometh to the Father. He hath overcome the world; on which account His

disciples may be of good cheer (xvi. 33); and His going away brings about the sending of the Holy Ghost (xvi. 7). He has the power (xvii. 2, 3, 6) to give eternal life to all men. He manifests to them God's name, in order that God's love may pass from Him (the Son) to them, and that they through Him may obtain a share in His everlasting glory.

From all these expressions, both in the Gospel of St. John and also in the synoptical discourses, it may be plainly inferred that it is not merely *the pitying love of God and the divine counsel in general* which is pointed out by Jesus as the groundwork of the redemption, but also and especially *His own person*, in which dwells the fulness of divine life, and the complete divine power for the communication of this life to men; also as being the person through whom redemption is effected, and with whom men must have communion in faith, in order to have a share of this redemption, as is shown by the comparison to a vine and its branches. *Salvation proceeds from God, but it is bound up in the person of Jesus*, through whom it is effected and proffered. Thus the Old Testament idea of salvation assumes a peculiar shape, to which, indeed, it already tended in the contents of the Old Testament, inasmuch as all prophecy points out some personality on which salvation is to be based. This, then, also was the impression made by the person of Jesus, His teaching, and His intercourse with men, both on His disciples and all those round Him. Thus, indeed, they express themselves (John vi. 68, 69; cf. Matt. xvi. 16, also Acts iv. 11, 12). We find a similar impression made on the Samaritans (John iv. 42), and likewise on Mary and Martha (John xi. 27).

We must now pass on to the consideration of the several elements of the teaching as to redeeming power.

§ 30. *The Subject of Redemption—The Relation of the Redeemer to the Old Testament Dispensation.*

It is so evident that Jesus recognised in His work a *relation to the Old Testament*, that it needs no proof. The fact has not, indeed, been denied, but has been explained from a rationalistic point of view as an accommodation to circumstances. But the accounts of the evangelists show that it was done with perfect earnestness. It was also done, not merely in the presence of the people and the scribes, but also before His apostles (Matt.

xxvi. 24, 31; Luke xxii. 37, xxiv. 44), indeed, even in prayer (John xvii. 12). There was in Him a fundamental idea which pervaded His whole consciousness. He knew that His appearance was necessarily predicted and prepared for in the Old Testament; and therefore in the various predictions, and also in the whole progress of the Old Testament dispensation of revelation, and the development of the theocratic people, He found a prophecy as to His person and work, and a clearing of the way for His appearance. He also recognised a *necessity* in His life and appearance, which was based on, and revealed by, this prophecy and preparation.

The main question, therefore, is, how He defined His relation to the Old Covenant when He testifies as to Himself. This, in general, appears clearly enough from the main fact, that *He declared Himself to be the Messiah*; and, connected with this, that during the period of His teaching He confined His ministry within the limits of the theocratic people. On this point He made a forcible declaration in the case of the Canaanitish woman (Matt. xv. 24; Mark vii. 27). He recognised it as a moral necessity, so long as He abode upon earth, that He should not deprive His nation of any part of His ministry; and finding Himself at that moment on the heathen frontier, He desired to make known to His disciples and others that He did not intend to transfer His ministry to others, and thus act contrary to His special Messianic destination. He also distinctly declares Himself to be the Messiah, by accepting the acknowledgment of His disciples to this effect. Thus in John i. 35 ff., where we are told that the disciples, one by one, made up their minds about Him; also in Matt. xvi. 13 ff., when, at the conclusion of His first year of teaching, Peter uttered this confession in the name of all the apostles. He by no means repelled the salutation of the people when they welcomed Him as the Messiah (Matt. xxi. 15, 16). He had, indeed, called it forth by the prophetic-symbolical form of His entry into Jerusalem. To the Baptist's disciples He confessed Himself to be "He that should come" (Matt. xi. 5). To individuals He expressly declared Himself to be the Messiah (*e.g.* John iv. 26, ix. 37, x. 25), and likewise before the highest tribunal in a solemn emphatic asseveration (Matt. xxvi. 64). He made this claim on the latter occasion, although He knew that it would bring about His death. Even if we did not possess all these utterances of

Jesus, we should have sufficient evidence in the fact, that after His death His disciples maintained and preached that He was the Messiah.

It has been a matter of controversy how soon the Lord announced Himself to be the Messiah (cf. § 12). Strauss says: "Jesus, having been at first a disciple of the Baptist, after the imprisonment of the latter only took the same position as the Baptist in the Messianic kingdom, although in a more liberal spirit. It was but gradually that He elevated Himself to the idea of being Himself the Messiah; and whenever this notion was expressed by others, He was terrified to hear others utter what He Himself scarcely ventured to suppose." Truly this would have been but a sorry hero to remodel the moral world! And yet it is a fact, that a revolution in mankind dates from the appearance of Jesus. That a person from whom a new era for humanity was to proceed should be represented as thus timid and wavering, is an idea which carries with it its own refutation. The exegetical arguments also do not stand their ground. It is said that in the Gospel of St. John only the declarations of Christ concerning Himself, and the opinions of His adherents concerning Him, maintain their consistency, and that in the synoptical books there are vacillations and relapses. But even in John, Jesus manifests Himself sometimes openly and sometimes more reservedly. Only compare, for example, ch. ii. 4 with the conversation with Nicodemus (ch. iii.) and the statements in ch. xi. 24 ff. (cf. § 12). On the other hand, the Sermon on the Mount, quite at the commencement of the synoptical accounts, what is it but a wisely calculated and yet unmistakeable Messianic discourse (cf. particularly the emphasis laid on His own person in ch. v. 11, vii. 21-24)? Moreover, His further ministry, His prescriptions to His disciples, His teaching, and His miracles, are not all these the very things which He Himself characterized as Messianic (Matt. xi. 5)? It is, besides, said that the fact of His gradually growing consciousness may be inferred from His forbidding (even in the synoptical gospels) the divulging of His name as the Messiah (Mark viii. 30; Matt. xvi. 20; Mark ix. 9; Matt. xvii. 9; Luke ix. 21), and from His *appearing* to speak of the Messiah as of some other person than Himself (Matt. x. 23, xiii. 37, xvi. 27, ch. xxiv.). But even in the synoptical gospels He never repels any acknowledgment of His Messiahship (Matt. viii. 10-13, ix. 18-26). He is

also zealous against any attacks on His personal dignity as a divine ambassador and worker of miracles (Matt. xii. 24-27). Perhaps, however, He was desirous that He should be recognised by His works as well as by His direct statements; and this is a wish which betrays no vacillation, but is fully justifiable. Everywhere, however, He deals with His claim to the title of the Messiah with that didactic wisdom which was due to the subject, and in each particular case acts according to the nature and susceptibility of those with whom He had to do. He was compelled to act thus, so as not to impede the successful result of His testimony as to Himself. He was also obliged to modify the prevailing ideas as to a Messiah, and, in conjunction with this, to speak of His own person, sometimes openly, sometimes more reservedly; but there is, in reality, no shadow of a proof that He ever spoke of the Messiah as a third person.

As the Messiah and Fulfiller of the new covenant, it is Jesus in whom the old covenant attains its accomplishment. As such, He recognises most eminently the *divine character of the Old Testament dispensation* (John iv. 22). Salvation, which is here considered as something future, is "of the Jews" through the revelation afforded them, and has its source-point in that people, owing to the knowledge of the true God which they possessed. The divine character of this dispensation is thus acknowledged. He fixes a limit to this dispensation in John the Baptist (Matt. xi. 12; Luke xvi. 16). He ascribes divine authority to the scriptures of the Old Testament, to which He often appeals; in virtue of which authority both belief and obedience are due to them from men, and through the whole course of the history these scriptures "must be fulfilled." He speaks of them, using various terms which were current among the Jews, such as *γραφὴ* and *γραφαί* (John x. 35, v. 39; Matt. xxvi. 54), and *νόμος* (John x. 34). In other places the Pentateuch is understood by this latter expression (Matt. xii. 5); or *Moses and the prophets* (Luke xvi. 31); or even the *law and the prophets* (Matt. v. 17, vii. 12, xxii. 40, cf. xi. 13; Luke xvi. 16); or the *scriptures of the prophets* (Matt. xxvi. 56; Luke xviii. 31, τὰ γεγραμμένα διὰ τῶν προφητῶν).

The complex of the Old Testament books contains elements of two kinds,—Moses and the prophets, or the law and prophecy. In the Sermon on the Mount, He enters into the relation in which He stood to these two elements of the dispensation (Matt. v. 17-19)

and ascribes especially to the law a *divine origin, and therefore inviolable stability*: not the least of the commandments was to be set aside (cf. Luke xvi. 17). He therefore elsewhere appeals to the divine law of the old covenant (Matt. xv. 3-6). In Matt. xxii. 35-40 He distinguishes the two greatest commandments,—the love of God, and of your neighbour; and the question as to what must be done to inherit eternal life is referred by Him to the commandments of the law (Luke x. 26 ff.). He goes further than this, and interprets the law, referring it, as with the rich young man (Matt. xix. 16 ff.), to the innermost grounds of the heart, and thus showing how He fulfilled it. On the other hand, the law is also contained in the prophets, especially an inculcation of its spirit. Hence, in Matt. vii. 12, Jesus brings forward the love of one's neighbour as the purport not only of the law, but of the prophets also,—that is, their moral purport. The second element is *prophecy*. The Lord says even of Moses that he had written of Him (John v. 45-47). This prophecy is recognised by Him as divine, and therefore authentic; and He lays it down as an axiom that the Scripture must be fulfilled (Matt. xxvi. 54, xvi. 21; Luke xxiv. 46; John xiii. 18, xvii. 12). Hence the expression $\delta\epsilon\iota$ or $\epsilon\delta\epsilon\iota$: it *must be done*, because only thus can the divine prediction and ordinance be realized (Luke xxii. 37). The Scriptures cannot be broken (John x. 35), because it is the revelation of the divine counsel.

In Moses and the prophets (Matt. v. 18, 19; Luke xvi. 29), there is, therefore, the absolute rule of life for Israelites and man. The Lord also appeals to the *historical records* of the Old Testament, and thus recognises their authority (Matt. xii. 3, 4, 42; Luke iv. 25-27; John iii. 14). But He especially declares that the *Scriptures testify of Him, and must be fulfilled in Him* (John v. 39). Of this kind are all the passages in the synoptical gospels in which He refers prophecies to His own life, or, as a proof of His Messiahship, brings forward Messianic features in prophecy which are realized in His life (Matt. xi. 4; cf. Is. xxxv. 5, lxi. 1).

He expressly lays down His relation to the Old Testament,—that it was *His personal destination to fulfil the Old Testament dispensation* (Matt. v. 17); as in Matt. xxi. 38, He is the heir of the vineyard, to whom it will revert. In this idea of fulfilment in Christ's person the two aspects of His relation to the Old

Testament—the accomplishment of the Old Testament dispensation, and its cessation in its temporal form—are most unequivocally contained.

In the first place, that through Him the essential purport and aim of this dispensation must attain *accomplishment*: in this, the whole contents of the Scriptures and the institutions of the old covenant are comprehended. Because He is called to this charge of *positive fulfilment*, He therefore declares so forcibly and decidedly that the very least of its commandments may not be broken (Matt. v. 18, 19; cf. Luke xvi. 17). But He does not imply that everything is to remain just as it is, but that nothing in it is without its true import and its high-abiding aim; and in this sense it remains, in that it is fulfilled. The *πληρῶσαι* must not be limited to the teaching,—teaching and doing being both implied. The people must of course attain to a knowledge of the divine will, but the execution of that will by the Lord's people forms also a part of the fulfilment.

In this *πληρῶσαι* the *cessation* of the Old Testament dispensation is also involved, that is, as regards its *temporal economy*, or everything in it which was merely preparatory, and only the means to an end. That this follows from the *πληρῶσαι* is shown by a multitude of the Lord's utterances both in John and the synoptical gospels. Among them is that (Matt. xii. 8; cf. Mark ii. 28; Luke vi. 5) in which he asserts that the Son of man is Lord also of the *Sabbath*. His claim with regard to the Sabbath must apply to the whole temporal economy of the Old Testament. Thus, in Matt. xxvi. 28, He declares His blood to be that of a new covenant, and that His death, in that it brings about the remission of sins, is the condition of the new covenant between God and man, which is to take the place of the old covenant concluded on Sinai (cf. Heb. vii. 11, viii. 6–8). That which is recorded in Ex. xxiv. 8 was now done with higher potency, and the prophecy in Jer. xxxi. 31–34 is fulfilled. In announcing the realization of the new covenant, He also announces the *rejection of the Israelitish people* as the national object of theocracy: cf. the conclusion of the parable of the husbandmen (Matt. xxi. 38, 43, 44; Mark xii. 10; Luke xx. 18). This rejection is the consequence of the denial and slaying of the son and heir of the theocracy, who was the Lord of God's kingdom now appearing upon earth, which was no longer to have, like the old covenant, a

special national groundwork in the Jewish people, but was to be given to all men, who shall find one common unity in the kingdom of heaven (Luke xiii. 29; Matt. viii. 11). In conformity with this, the Lord predicts a *destruction of the temple* (Matt. xxiv. 1 ff.; Mark xiii. 1 ff.; Luke xxi. 5, 6). With this temple the Mosaic worship, especially as a sacrificial service, was bound up, and with it the national existence, and particularly Jerusalem, was to be subverted (Luke xxi. 20). *The people were to be scattered* "until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled." This is their well-merited sentence (Luke xxi. 23, 24, xix. 41-44; Matt. xxiv.). → IV

The Lord speaks in a like manner in John ix. 21, 23, 24. On the advent of the true worship, the *service of God in Jerusalem* will cease. This cessation is therefore a progress to the end desired by God. In John x. 16 Jesus speaks of other sheep which are not of this fold, and of the future, when there shall be *one flock and one Shepherd*. Here, therefore, there is an anticipation of the formation of a people and kingdom of God which are not to be confined to merely national limits. Hitherto the temple had formed, as a centre, the connecting band for God's people; henceforth their point of union was to be in Christ. The passage, John ii. 19, one of the earliest utterances of the Lord, at the time of His first Messianic visit to Jerusalem at the time of the feast, is also of a similar nature.

§ 31. *The Subject of Redemption—The Person and Circumstances of the Redeemer.*

That portion of the utterances of Jesus which belong to this subject have been already spoken of when considering the teaching as to the Son. In this general idea we have only to distinguish the distinct and *direct reference* of person and circumstances to the *work of redemption*.

With regard to this point, we must not forget that He never speaks of the redemption as something apart from Himself, but always as the very operation of His person, and as standing in inseparable relation to it, and its circumstances and course of action. Thus everything in Him, both the divine element of His nature and His coming from the Father, and also the element of His human lowliness on earth, and His condescension even to death, are placed in relation to His work. The simplest and most general expression for this idea is, that God sent Him for

the accomplishment of this work, as in the very sending the divinely human character of His person is implied. That He possesses the life of the Father, and also gives it; that the communion of believers with the Father is included in that of the Father with the Son; that their future glory is a partaking in His glory; that His knowledge of the Father and heavenly things constitutes the perfection of His teaching; His death and His resurrection,—all these facts are but more detailed expressions of this oneness of His work and His person. Sometimes He presents more prominently the divine, and sometimes the human, aspect of His person; but that they are joint attributes is shown by the attestations of His eminence, such as the judging in John v. 22 ff., being so emphatically brought into connection with His humanity.

There are, in the first place, *two main points* which we note, although the first only occurs in the discourses in John's Gospel, namely, His *pre-existence* (cf. § 22) and the *divinely human state*. The latter is divided into an *earthly* and *heavenly* existence. Into the former has He *come* (John xvii. 4, 11). The deep humiliation of His sufferings and death are clearly brought forward by Him as special conditions of His life (Matt. xvii.), and likewise His resurrection. The heavenly condition which was to follow is sometimes distinctly announced by Jesus as *going to the Father* and *being with Him* (John vi. 61, xvi. 5), and sometimes is made known by the promise of His return and His presence with believers. By this latter intimation the reference of this heavenly condition to the work of salvation is made clear; as respects the earthly condition, it is self-evident; and even of His pre-existence He has intimated this same relation in His remarkable words, that Abraham had rejoiced to see His day, and had seen it and was glad (John viii. 56 ff.). Thus the circumstances of His person in their various vicissitudes form the groundwork of His redeeming action.

§ 32. *The Subject of Redemption—The Agency of the Redeemer in general, and especially His Life and Teaching on Earth.*

Jesus comprehends the whole of His agency on earth as the accomplishment of a work committed to Him by God (John xvii. 4, iv. 34), a work that originated in God's will, and is completed in the divine power,—completed, indeed, by Christ, to

whom as the Redeemer it is committed; not that it is accomplished by Him as a work alien to Himself, but as one belonging to His person, and in which He is well pleased. Neither, on the other hand, is it on this account alien also to the Father, but tends to His glorification (John xvii. 4). This one *ἔργον*, in which His agency is comprised, must be distinguished from the *ἔργα* in the plural, or various works or miracles of Jesus. In other places He describes His work as a whole by expressions such as, "that He was sent" (John iii. 16; Matt. xv. 24), or, "that He had come" (Matt. v. 17, xviii. 11, ix. 13, xx. 28; Luke xix. 10); and of this His work, of His Messianic agency, His teaching and living on earth form the chief part.

In the first place, His *teaching*. When the Baptist sent to ask Jesus whether He were "He that should come," Jesus brought forward as a sign of His Messianic work various kinds of miracles; but, together with these, He mentions as an equally essential element that the gospel is preached to the *πτωχοί*, referring to Isa. lxi. 1. Jesus likewise considers the revelation of the Father to be a special work of the Son (Matt. xi. 27; cf. Luke x. 22). Therefore the communication of the message of salvation, and the revelation of the Father, form essential elements of His Messianic teaching. In the parable of the sower, whose seed falls in various soils (Luke viii. 5; Mark iv. 3; Matt. xiii. 3), He explains that the seed is the word of the kingdom of God now appearing (Matt. xiii. 19), or the word of God merely (Luke viii. 11; Mark iv. 14). To scatter this seed is essentially the business of the Son of man. We must, besides, take into consideration the passages in which the Lord attaches a deep importance to His teaching; as in Luke viii. 21, where those who hear the word and do it are styled His mother and His brethren; or in Matt. x. 24, xxiii. 10, 8, in which He calls Himself the Master or Teacher of His disciples, He being absolutely the only master. In John xvii. 6-8, we see that revealing, that is, teaching the name of the Father, entirely and especially forms a part of Christ's work. His word is a sure and certain testimony as to earthly and heavenly things (John iii. 11, 12), depending upon an adequate knowledge of the Father attained to by Him alone (John vi. 45, 46). His word is divine doctrine, and recognisable as such by him who is willing to do the will of the Father (John vii. 16, 17). Whoever continued in His word

should know the truth, which sets free from the bondage of sin, as divine truth which delivers from death (John viii. 32, cf. xii. 47, 50). Prophecy also forms a part of the teaching of Christ, in that it is nothing else but the statement of the divine counsel of salvation as it was to be realized in the future.

The extent to which the Lord describes His teaching as an element of His redeeming action is in part made clear by the utterances we have just considered. His teaching is a message of salvation to mankind that needed it (Matt. xi. 5; Mark i. 15); it is God's word (John xvii. 6, 8, xiv. 20) communicated to Him by the Father, in order thereby to bring about eternal life (John xii. 49); it is the word which is the spirit and the life (John vi. 63), or briefly, is the truth which sets free from sin and death (John viii. 32, 34-36), and confers a true knowledge both of the Father and of the Son (John xvii. 6, 8). It has, therefore, the power of purifying men (John xv. 3), and of communicating eternal life (John xvii. 3). His words retain an everlasting value, although heaven and earth may pass away, and are therefore intended to be a common good for all nations (Mark xiii. 10). Thus the teaching of Jesus is a representation of Himself and of His consciousness, of that, namely, which was communicated to Him by the Father, which He Himself perceived and understood (John vi. 45, 46), and what He Himself is (xvii. 8). This representation of Himself is at the same time a representation of the Father (xvii. 6, xiv. 7-9, xii. 45), because the Son is one with the Father (xiv. 10). As a representation of self, it is also a communication of Himself, a communication of that which exists in His consciousness, so that abiding in His word is an abiding in Him (John xv. 7, xiv. 22). The action of His teaching is therefore unique in its kind: it is not concluded with His earthly instructions, but is carried on, in the first place, by the agency of the Holy Ghost, who shall guide into all truth (John xvi. 13). The Spirit carries forward the teaching of Jesus, by supplying the deficiencies which existed owing to the unbelief of the disciples, and by perfecting the teaching of Jesus out of Jesus Himself, and not from any alien source (cf. § 24). He also recognised another continuation of the action of His teaching in the ministry of His apostles, to whom this Spirit is promised as the substitute for His presence among them, who also, in virtue of their personal intercourse with Him, were to testify of Him

(John xv. 27), and through whom the gospel was to be brought to all nations. (Matt. xxviii. 20).

But with His *work* is also associated His *life*, inasmuch as it was a *representation of His entire personality in His earthly life* as regarded men, and of its influence on them, therefore His entire course of action, so far as this can be distinguished from His teaching. All this the Lord considers as belonging to His work, in the first place, in the passages in which He represents Himself as the image of His Father (John xii. 45, xiv. 7-10). Jesus is so much the image of the Father, that whosoever knows Him knows the Father also. The seeing, *ὁρᾶν*, *θεωρεῖν*, in these passages must not, indeed, be limited to the mere sight of the person of Jesus; still less, when He says that He is to be known in order to know the Father, can we refer this merely to the effect of His teaching. But we must take the language as comprehensively as it is intended,—that the knowledge of His person (of which, indeed, the outward perception forms a part, although this is but a feeble commencement of the knowledge of Him) is, in virtue of the consubstantiality of the two, likewise a knowledge of the Father.

But in the redeeming action of His life is also included His whole course of action: He always does the will of the Father (John viii. 29), and therefore no one can convince Him of sin (viii. 46). This is also proved by the passages in which He represents His sentiments and way of acting as a model to His disciples, which they are to imitate and follow (John xiii. 14-17, 34; Matt. xvi. 24), principally in His love and His renunciation of the world (cf. Matt. x. 38). The idea of the yoke (Matt. xi. 39) which His disciples are to take upon themselves, is also of a similar nature in its teaching and type. His *ἔργα*, especially His *miracles* (John xv. 24, ix. 3-5), constitute special points in His redeeming action. Jesus appeals to these miracles as elements of His Messianic functions, and as vouchers for His dignity. He therefore declares that, although He had a just claim that men should believe His word (John xiv. 11), yet if this claim were resisted, His works were of that nature that on their account belief could not be refused. In some cases, indeed, in the course of His teaching, He appears to speak differently as to His miracles, and points out that it is more worthy to believe in Him when no miracles are done by Him, complaining that He

was only believed in so far as people were as if compelled to believe by seeing the miracles which He did (John iv. 48). But the right way of understanding this language may be inferred from John xiv. 11, that, apart from His miracles, there were adequate grounds for believing in Him contained in His teaching and entire personality ; in this, however, there is no intimation that His miracles, in their nature and aim, were *not* to be, in fact, means of exciting and confirming faith in Him. Likewise, in the accounts in the synoptical gospels, He sometimes forbids the publication of certain miracles done by Him (as Mark vii. 36) ; but the reason for this is not that He did not wish His miracles to be seen by the people, but that in some cases He thought it desirable, either that His own person should remain unmolested, or that those healed should be in undisturbed quiet, so as to retain the impression made upon them. The miracles were in general well fitted, and indeed intended, to bring into view the individual distinction of His person. They were the corroboration of His personality, which was unique in its nature, and of the relation to the Father which was peculiar to Him. In their ethical aspect, too, they were proofs of the wisdom and love which befitted this personality.

He brings forward another peculiar element of His redeeming action in the *voluntary humiliation of His life on earth*, which found its consummation in His death. He regards as specially worthy of remark in His moral procedure, both His *self-denial and self-sacrifice of the lower life* in order to attain a higher, and also His ministering and devoted love to men. In this, His earthly life is for the most part shown to be a position of lowliness, His miracles manifesting His exaltation. In one sense this lowly aspect of His life is represented as a pattern (Matt. xvi. 23-26, cf. 21 ; John xii. 24, 25 ; Matt. xx. 26-28 ; John xv. 12, 13) ; but in another and superior sense it is an element of His redeeming action which we are now about to consider.

§ 33. *The Subject of Redemption—the Sufferings and Death of the Redeemer.*

It clearly follows from the predictions made by Jesus as to His sufferings and death, as recorded both in John and the synoptical books, that He considered *His sufferings and death as elements of His work*. In St. John's Gospel the intimations as to His sufferings

and death are found in the first period of His public life, and are continued through the whole course of it. From the commencement onwards these intimations are veiled under typical delineations, as was indeed necessary, for He would otherwise have anticipated the historical development in an unsuitable way. He could at first speak of the subject under a veiled form only, the result of which would be that, by continued reflection and a comparison with the progressive historical development of His life, His hearers would be led to the really intended sense of His words. The disciples, indeed, perceived this after their eyes had been opened by the whole course of His appearance on earth: cf. John ii. 19, 22, where, together with His death, the resurrection is also hinted at in a veiled form. There is also the passage (John iii. 14, 15) in which we have the figure of the approaching lifting up of the Son of man, as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness: cf. ch. viii. 28. The words in John vi. 51 ff. are in somewhat plainer terms, but yet in their whole connection are veiled from the immediate hearers. The ideas are more openly expressed in ch. x. 11, 15-18, and also ch. xii. 7, 24. The valedictory discourses as to His departure to the Father immediately follow,—that they (His disciples) should see Him no more, and that they should mourn, but that afterwards they should again see Him, and He should see them (cf. xiii.-xvii.); finally, we have the account of the sufferings and death.

In the synoptical evangelists, the intimations as to His approaching death do not commence till later in the history, except those given in Galilee. The earliest of them, however, is again a figurative one, which leads us to think that this typical mode of speaking of the matter is characteristic of the earlier period of His life. This is the mention of the sign of the prophet Jonah (Matt. xii. 39 f., xvi. 4; Luke xi. 29 f.): although in Luke the reference to the personal fortunes of Jonah is not brought prominently forward, yet this second element in the type is not excluded, but is, on the contrary, intimated in the *ἔσται* in ver. 30. Next follow the predictions of His death, which were addressed to the apostles: (1) Matt. xvi. 21; Mark viii. 31; Luke ix. 22: (2) Matt. xvii. 22, 23; Mark ix. 31; Luke ix. 44: (3) Matt. xx. 18, 19; Mark x. 33 ff.; Luke xviii. 31-34: (4) Matt. xxvi. 2; after which the account of His sufferings commences. The words are opportunely introduced (Mark xiv. 8; cf. John xii. 7) which

the Lord spoke to Mary at Bethany. All these predictions of His death show that He looked upon His death and sufferings as essentially belonging to the divine work committed to Him, and to the divine order of His life: cf. § 18. It is, besides, clear, both from these and also from other passages, to how great an extent His sufferings and death formed an essential part of His redeeming action. The utterances of the Lord on the point are, in part, of a more general purport; but some of them lead to the special doctrine of a relation of the death of Christ to the work of redemption. Even the former, taken in connection with the others, lead us further than would at first sight appear.

Jesus looked upon His death as, in the first place, constituting *the condition for a bringing forth of much fruit*, just as the corn of wheat must fall into the ground and die ere it can produce much fruit (John xii. 24). To this He annexes a reflection similar to that in Matt. xvi. 21, where, with His first prediction of His death to the disciples, He connects the warning that, without a self-renunciation and self-surrender of this kind, no one can be a true disciple. His death is the condition necessary for the production of much fruit among mankind, and, indeed, in a wide sphere, and without distinction of nations; for He says it in reference to "certain Greeks" (John xii. 20). His death is, too, a necessary condition of His glorification as the Son of man (ver. 23). He enters with complete resignation upon the bitterness of this death, which He duly feels (ver. 27), and on it bases the certainty that the prince of this world will be overthrown (ver. 31). He, however, will draw all men unto Him (ver. 32). In other passages, as John x. 15, in the figurative language as to the Good Shepherd, it is not only said of the latter that He had come in order that His sheep should have life and sufficiency of pasture, but also that He gives His life for the sheep which have been committed to His guidance: He lays down His life in order to deliver them from death when the wolf spoils, rends, and scatters the sheep (ver. 12). This sacrifice of His life, which as it was consequent on His vocation as a Good Shepherd in contrast to a hireling (vers. 11, 12), depended on His free will. But Jesus' surrender of His life was also so bound up in the will of God, that God loves Him on account of this willing readiness to lay down His life (ver. 17); but with this surrender of His life is to be joined the taking it again. He thus considers the sacrifice of His life as a

death *not only for the advantage generally of His people, but also in the place of His people*, inasmuch as, through His death, His people are to be saved from death and perdition. Finally, in Matt. xx. 28, He considers the life to be surrendered by Him, in self-sacrificing, ministering love as a *λύτρον*, a *ransom* for many: cf. 1 Tim. ii. 6; 1 Pet. i. 18, 19; Heb. ix. 12. This naturally calls to mind the passage (Matt. xvi. 26) in which the question is asked as to what a man will give to win again the soul which is under sentence for guilt. That which man does not possess is given by Christ, who is come to serve him by giving His life in man's behalf. He therefore says, after His resurrection (Luke xxiv. 26, 27), "Ought not Christ to have suffered these things and to enter into His glory?" His sufferings and resurrection are made (Luke xxiv. 46, 47) the necessary condition, according to the divine ordinance, for *μετάνοια* and *ἄφεσις ἁμαρτιῶν* being preached to the world. The death of Christ is therefore *the condition for the remission of sins, and its preaching among all nations*; and the ransom is the life of Christ offered up for many, who through sin and guilt have become subject to the divine justice, whose souls, therefore, are answerable to God and to His punishment. This is more closely defined in particular passages, the death of Christ being sometimes described *objectively* as a *giving away of Christ to God for men*, and sometimes as a *communication of His sacrificially offered life* for the subjective appropriation of men. In the former case it is more of a *propitiatory*, in the latter, of a *redeeming* character.

Among the utterances which represent His death in the *propitiatory* aspect, the chief statements in the synoptical books are the words used at the institution of the Lord's Supper. They are found in all three evangelists; and the relation of the death of Christ to the work of salvation is specially stated in them. For this very relation is intended to be represented by the Lord's Supper. The words used at this institution are divided into two parts: first, with respect to the bread and the body of Christ; and next, as to the wine and the blood of Christ. For the first, cf. Matt. xxvi. 26; Mark xiv. 22; Luke xxii. 19. The two first evangelists only say, *τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου*; Luke adds, *τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον*; and Paul's account, which agrees most with that of Luke, gives (1 Cor. xi.) *κλώμενον*, the body which in His death was given and broken for His disciples,—an idea which is identical

with the sense of the general utterances of the Lord as to His death, that it was for the salvation of men (the *διδόμενον* and *κλώμενον* are not to be referred to the bread, or, at least, not to the bread alone, but to Jesus' body; but yet there is also conveyed an allusion to the breaking and division of the bread, by which His body is represented). In the second portion of the words of institution, there are certain special references. The Lord designates His blood (1) as "the blood of the new testament;" (2) in Matthew and Mark, as "shed for many;" in Luke, "for you;" and in Matthew is added, "for the remission of sins."

In the words in Matthew and Mark, *τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ αἷμα, τὸ τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης*, reference is made to the blood of the old covenant which was established with Moses and the people of Israel, and was consecrated by the sacrificial blood (Ex. xxiv. 8; Heb. ix. 20). The *blood of the covenant* is the blood by which the covenant (here, therefore, the *new* covenant) is formally concluded and consecrated. The more exact meaning must be inferred from the idea of the new covenant. This had been already spoken of in the Old Testament, in Jer. xxxi. 31 ff., a passage which is referred to in Heb. viii. 8–12 and x. 16–18. From these passages the new covenant is to be thus constituted: (1) that the *law of God* is to be *stamped* on man's *heart*, instead of the Mosaic law, which had always been an external matter for them, which did not essentially and completely pervade their minds; (2) that God should forgive them all their sins; not merely this or that individual sin, but all their sins, perfectly. There is therefore understood by this *a covenant of more complete alliance and forgiveness*, and this is to be concluded and consecrated by the death of Jesus Christ, and in virtue thereof.

In Matthew and Mark, it follows, next, that the blood of Jesus Christ was shed for many (in Matthew it is added, "*for the remission of sins*")—*περὶ πολλῶν*, for the sake of many. In Mark, however, there is another reading, *ὑπέρ*; but even then, if interpreted according to the *περὶ*, it would be *in behalf* of many.¹ So also in Luke xxii. 20, *ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυνόμενον*; only this is said of the *ποτήριον*, which perfectly agrees with the reference to the *αἷμα* in the other synoptical books. But this can only be affirmed

¹ This different reading, *ὑπέρ*, is found also in St. Matthew, Cod. Bezae; and should, without doubt, take the place of the *περὶ* of the *textus receptus* in St. Mark, where some MSS. and versions add *εἰς ἄφαισιν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν*.—TR.

of the ποτήριον or its contents so far as the latter is considered a sign of the αἷμα. The blood is shed for the sake of many. This calls to mind the sacrificial blood which was shed in the consecration of the Mosaical covenant, and sprinkled over the people. This blood has a reference to the forgiveness of sins, as Matthew expressly states, although this reference, even without this express statement, would hold good. For the Mosaic sacrifice was offered for many, as atoning for the sins of many; and so must the blood of Christ be looked upon here as the *blood of a sacrifice atoning for the sins of many*. Endeavour has indeed been made to lay a stress upon the idea, that it was a ratifying and not a sacrificial offering. But when a covenant is completed between God and man, the matter in question must be the reconciliation of God with man, who is alienated from God by sin, and, especially in a biblical view, guilty in His sight. The new covenant, as shown above, especially includes this complete forgiveness. If, now, this new covenant is brought about by the blood of Christ, who gave Himself up to death for us, then in the death of Christ is also involved the bringing about of the forgiveness of sins. This is the exposition of the nature and aim of the shedding of Christ's blood which best corresponds to the whole context. Thus, in these words of institution, so far as they relate to the blood of Christ, *the death of Jesus is represented as the reconciliation of men with God*, and as thus *bringing about the forgiveness of sins*; and this is connected with the view of the Old Testament as to the atoning sacrifice and the shedding of blood thereto belonging, of which it is said in Lev. xvii., "The life of the flesh is in the blood, which I have given to you for an atonement."

In the Gospel of St. John we have first to consider the two utterances of Jesus, which were given, one at the beginning, and one at the end, of His ministry (John iii. 14, 15, xvii. 19). The first, being given so early in His ministry, is veiled under a figure. After the Lord had converted Nicodemus into a willing hearer, and thus found opportunity, He begins to give the latter some intimations as to His person and His work, and the aim of His mission (John iii. 11 ff.). In the first place, to the effect that He was to be believed as one that bore witness of what He had seen; as one that had come down from heaven; who in the midst of earthly things was still heavenly. He then adds, that "as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man

be lifted up" (ver. 14). Here, too, He avails Himself of an analogy derived from the old covenant, in order to express something about Himself and His death; and by this simile the matter is more veiled than the allusion, in the introductory words to the Lord's Supper, to the old covenant consecrated with blood. But there are preponderating arguments for the idea that the Lord spoke here of His own death. This reference has, indeed, been entirely denied; but the analogy afforded by two other utterances of the Lord and the purport of the present passage itself are opposed to this view. In two passages the Lord describes the *ὑψοῦν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* as something which should happen to Him in the future; and in these we cannot (as is desired) attribute to the words the signification and recognition of spiritual exaltation (John xii. 32, viii. 28). Jesus probably used the Aramaic word *זקף*, to hang up, as a kind of execution (cf. Esth. vii. 10, ix. 13), equivalent to crucifixion. But even if He used another verb (as in Num. xxi. 8, 9, *שׂים עַל-יָם*), still the explanation is preferable which does not exclude the reference to the death of Jesus. Apart, however, from these parallel passages, the purport of the utterance itself leads us to the same conclusion. The "lifting up" of Jesus is compared to that of the serpent in the wilderness; but this latter elevation could not have been intended to bring about a recognition of its eminence, but, on the contrary, to point to the conquered and annihilated state either of the serpent or of its effects,—to express that the spiritual serpent is rendered harmless, and as if put away. In the crucifixion, Jesus is the figure of crucified, and thus destroyed sin; but by sin and, as implied in the type of the serpent, its first originator being thus destroyed, He in whom this takes place is represented as the conqueror, and truly as He who is lifted up.

In the *second utterance* of the Lord which we have to consider (John xvii. 19), is contained, in the first place, a prayer for His *immediate* disciples; for His future disciples are not the subjects of intercession until ver. 20. The Lord had prayed that the Father should not take them out of the world, but would preserve them from the evil, and sanctify them through the truth,—“Thy word is truth.” He then adds, that He sanctifies Himself for their sakes, that they also might be sanctified through the truth. This His *ἀγιάζειν* is the provisional condition for their sanctification through the truth in ver. 19; therefore it must

refer back to the same word in ver. 17, for He adopts it into His prayer only as the condition for the essential sanctification of the disciples. Now these words cannot mean that He had sanctified and consecrated Himself as their predecessor, or for His Messianic office. In this case the verb must have been in the aorist or perfect. In vers. 4, 6, He thus speaks of what He had already done; indeed, He now considers Himself as no longer being in the world, so much does He count Himself at the end of His life, being on the point of going out to meet His death. The present tense points to that which alone remained for Him to do, that is, to His death. The *ἀγιάζειν* in ver. 19 must therefore refer to His death as a moral action on His part, done in obedience to the Father, and in love to His people. *Ἀγιάζειν*, in Matt. xxiii. 17, 19, is to *dedicate to God*. This verb is also used for that which God does in Him (John x. 36): God has sanctified Him and sent Him into the world; He is therefore also the *ἀγιάζων* (Heb. ii. 11) by whom His people become *ἀγιαζόμενοι*. It therefore means: (1.) To dedicate as an offering, for a gift to God (Lev. xxii. 2, 3; cf. Deut. xv. 19). Thence it is said of an offering acceptable to God, "that it is sanctified" (Rom. xv. 16). Paul figuratively describes the converted Gentiles as an offering dedicated to God. (2.) To clear from sin, to atone for and sanctify (Ex. xxix. 36) both the altar and men (Ezek. xliv. 19). Therefore this word occurs in the LXX. (Ex. xxix. 36) for *קָדַשׁ*; and for the Christian community (Eph. v. 26), that Christ might sanctify and cleanse it; also for Christians as *ἀγιαζόμενοι* (Heb. ii. 11, x. 10; Acts xx. 32; 1 Cor. i. 2). According to this, the signification in the passage we are considering may be held to be, I sanctify myself for them,—that is, I dedicate myself to God as an offering for them, so that they by this offering may be reconciled with God, and themselves also sanctified, which can indeed be done by means of the divine word only (ver. 17). As the effect of the self-surrender of Christ the Son as an offering to the Father for His own people, they will be essentially sanctified in truth, not only because this self-surrender is the means for the communication of the Holy Spirit, but also, in harmony with the teaching of the New Testament generally, according to which all sanctification is conditional on the atonement, through the forgiveness of sins and justification: cf. 1 Peter ii. 24. Thus this passage in St. John

leads us back again to the introductory words to the Lord's Supper, only that here the essential sanctification of believers is expressly connected with the self-devotion of Christ as an offering (cf. 1 John ii. 2, iv. 10 ; Rom. viii. 12 ; Eph. v. 1).

Thus these two passages set forth the two main points, the subjection of sin and the consecration to God, as the results of the death of Jesus ; they are, too, in essential harmony with the synoptical passages.

All the passages we have hitherto considered have exhibited the death of Christ in its atoning aspect as regards God and man. There are, however, in St. John, some utterances peculiar to him, in which (an idea only implied in the previous texts) *His life offered up in His death* is represented as being *communicated to men for their subjective appropriation*. It is thus in John vi. 51–58. In reference to the feeding of five thousand people with five loaves, which had taken place the previous day, the Lord had called Himself the bread which had come down from heaven, and would give life to the world. He then, towards the end of His discourse, enters specially upon the subject (vers. 51–58), by saying that the bread which He would give them was His flesh, which He would give for the life of the world. When His Jewish hearers, striving among themselves, asked how this man could give them His flesh to eat ? the Lord continued, by saying that His flesh and blood were indeed meat and drink (ver. 55), and that whosoever eateth and drinketh them hath eternal life, and should be raised up at the last day,—that he dwelleth in Christ, and Christ in him. The question is as to the reference implied in the word *σὰρξ*. On this point the first thing to be considered is, that the usage of the language *per se* permits the direct reference to death ; for, when the linguistic use of the word *σὰρξ* is appealed to as denoting the bodily life as in a living state, it is forgotten that, although *σὰρξ* denotes the life, it is the earthly mortal life (cf. 2 Cor. iv. 11). Thus the apostles often mention the *σὰρξ* of Jesus when His death is in question (Eph. ii. 14, 15 ; Col. i. 20, 21 ; 1 Peter iii. 18). It depends, however, also on this point whether, in the passage John vi. 51, the words *ἡν ἐγὼ δώσω* are genuine. If so, this is also in favour of the direct reference to the death of Jesus (Luke xxii. 19 ; Gal. i. 4, ii. 20). The omission of these words has the advantage, in opposition to the *Recepta*, as the most ancient Codices B, D, etc.,

the Itala, and Origen, do not give them. Notwithstanding this, the fuller reading is very ancient; Origen, in some other passages, and Clement giving it. It may be said, too, in its favour, that the words, on account of the repetition, might readily be omitted in copying or citation. On the other hand, the shorter reading is the *lectio difficilior*, and the fuller one has more of the nature of a gloss. Thus Lachmann also has left it out of the text. In this shorter redaction, of course, we lose an argument in favour of the reference of this verse to the death of Jesus. But, apart from the fact that the propriety of the omission is not yet proved, the other words still remain, and are in a high degree favourable to this reference. In the *second* place, we have to look to the connection first with what follows, and then with what precedes. The former is appealed to against our view. It is said that in verse 53 the Lord entirely drops the idea of death; that the formulæ in vers. 53 and 56 have a symbolical meaning, which is distinctly explained in ver. 56 as the community of being with the living Redeemer; indeed, that if the Lord was speaking here as to His death, it would amount to a summons to the Jews to kill Him, which would be a most manifest inconsistency. But these opinions are very rashly given. Jesus does not summon them to kill Him, or else He must have said that His earthly life was to be resolved into flesh and blood; but He only requires that His flesh and blood should be partaken of, and be made use of, and that He Himself should be appropriated when He had at some future time entered upon death. Even if we allow that ver. 53 f. has a symbolical reference, it does not follow, from the above-named reasons, that this may not apply to the death of Jesus; for else He would never have been able to speak of His death before unbelievers, and least of all before His enemies, without its being a summons to them to kill Him. On the contrary, after, in ver. 51, He had said that He would give them His flesh, He goes on to explain this by the words that His flesh must be eaten, and His blood must be drunk; thus, by an intimation of the violent shedding of His blood in death, giving an answer to the question (ver. 52) in what way He could give His flesh to be eaten. For He so separates the flesh and the blood, that we must distinguish these expressions from the other usage of the language in which the two words are combined in one expression to designate the living personality. He speaks,

therefore, clearly of flesh and blood as of a resolved unity, and consequently of life given up to death. This is in no way altered by ver. 57, in which, concluding His development of the subject, He reverts to the starting-point as given in the first half of ver. 51,—the second half of ver. 51 and vers. 53–56 giving the special development which is included in the general expression. We now come to the connection of our passage with the matter which precedes it. The Jews, who demanded of Jesus some outward sign, after the manner of Moses, in order that they might believe in Him (vers. 30, 31), are told by the Lord that Moses did not give the true bread from heaven, but that it was His Father who gives it to them; and when they showed themselves desirous of obtaining it, He adds, that He was this bread (vers. 32–35); that He gives the life which overcomes death, and that by this effect His life was distinguished from the Mosaic bread from heaven. Now comes the question, Is the death of Christ plainly intended as the instrumental cause of this, and how far is it intended? Is the general idea to be thus expressed: My life given up to death must be spiritually appropriated by man, in order that he may be spiritually nourished thereby? or does the Lord desire to say more? Did He take the pains to deliver a discourse, occasioning so much misunderstanding, solely to express the above-named simple idea? This must seem strange, as the misunderstanding might have been so easily avoided, if, in passing on to His life-giving death, He had omitted the figure of eating and drinking. The idea would be retained that His death was something which man must appropriate to himself, which was proffered to him in faith in order to nourish his spiritual life. The choice of a figure so especially likely to give offence to the Israelites is, however, completely explained if He had some more widely extending aim,—if, in fact, He desired to intimate not only that His life, when given up to death, would be spiritually communicated as a glorifying principle, but also as a divinely incarnate power, which would quicken and glorify corporeally as well as spiritually. With this ver. 55 is also quite in harmony. But this one verse is not sufficient to prove this explanation as the only necessary one. Both views, therefore, remain exegetically possible. Connected with this is the question as to the reference to the Lord's Supper. It cannot, however, be said that this

chapter plainly and directly treats of this, as, even apart from it, it conveys a truth; yet it is to be supposed that the two are in relation, and that the Lord may have spoken these words with an anticipatory reference to the Lord's Supper which was to be instituted by Him. The signification of the body and blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper can, indeed, be never brought to any conclusion by purely exegetical means, but by dogmatical reference to the whole doctrine of the person and work of Christ; and, besides this, the passages recording the institution must be taken in connection with everything else on the point which is contained in the New Testament. As regards the passage we are considering, this much is established,—that the death of Christ is spoken of by Him under the aspect of a sacrificial death, and that John xvii. 19 can be satisfactorily explained in this way only. The sacrifice was, in the Old Testament, a thing offered to God; but, through this offering, it was also a dedicated object to be communicated to men who had a share in the sacrifice. The sacrificial idea in these two aspects was completed in the death of Christ. Christ, being dedicated as a sacrifice, is also that which is communicated to men as meat and drink, by which they may be nourished and quickened.

§ 34. *The Subject of Redemption—The Agency of the Redeemer in His Supernatural Position—Conclusion.*

In the synoptical discourses, the Lord speaks of a *perpetual presence* with His people as of something which is efficacious and beneficial (Matt. xviii. 20, xxviii. 20); for which reason the unanimous prayer of those who are assembled in His name shall not fail in being granted (Matt. xviii. 19); and this is a result of the fact that to Him all power is given both in heaven and earth. But this perpetual presence does not exclude a *coming* of the Lord, a new form of His presence and agency on earth. Therefore He speaks of a coming of this kind, or a *coming again in His supernatural condition*, as being a peculiar manifestation to mankind, a *coming in His kingdom* (cf. § 22). There are, accordingly, manifold kinds of the agency of the supernatural Christ upon earth, following the course of development of His kingdom. In Matt. xvi. 27, 28, He refers to the above-mentioned special coming; in this, there is a definition of the time: There be some which shall not taste of death. This is His return as Lord and

King of His kingdom on earth, in the clouds of heaven for judgment. The former class of these utterances are explained more in detail in the Gospel of St. John, the others in connection with the teaching as to the kingdom of God.

In the *farewell discourses in St. John* it is clearly and prominently set forth, that Jesus' going away to His Father, and His glorification with Him, is the foundation of a peculiar agency. This is described generally by Him as advantageous to His disciples (John xvi. 7, xiv. 12, ~~18~~, xii. 32), in order to free them from sorrow, and to induce them to be joyful (although in ch. xii. 32 it is mentioned in connection with the lifting up upon the cross). He therefore attributes to Himself a peculiar action in a supernatural state in the following respects: (1.) As intercessor with the Father for His disciples (ch. xiv. 16). Thus He, in His glorified state, brings about the gracious action of the Father for the benefit of men, so that the Father does everything for the sake of the Son (ch. xvi. 23, 24). The sending of the Spirit especially forms a part of this intercession. On the other hand He says that they have no need of this intercession (ch. xvi. 26, 27); that they will themselves pray, because they love God,—not absolutely, but only *in Christ*. By virtue of His calling faith into existence, there already exists a fellowship of believers with God; but this does not exclude an intercession on the part of Christ with a view to the communication of the Spirit, and a continuance of His interposition generally. The Father fulfils the prayers made by Christ's people in His name (ch. xvi. 23, 24), and it is done for the sake of Christ. The "I will" in ch. xvii. 24 is not merely the will exercised on earth, but the continuous will for the welfare and redemption of His people which procures the action of the Father in behalf of believers. (2.) Christ, however, does more than act as a mediator: *He Himself, when glorified, operates for the welfare of men*, at the termination as well as during the course of His earthly life. He draws all men unto Him (John xii. 32), so that there should be one fold and one Shepherd (x. 16). He goes into this subject more in detail in His farewell discourses in and after the Last Supper, before He was taken prisoner, in which He insists that the parting which was then impending was no separation, and that His disciples will remain in communion with Him. He then points out, as a result following from His going away, that He Himself will send them the

Spirit. Before, He had said that He would pray the Father for this; now, He says that He will Himself send Him (ch. xv. 26, xvi. 7). He will care for their welfare by fulfilling the prayers which are made to God in His name (ch. xiv. 13 f.): He Himself will do what they ask. These two things are, however, not to be looked upon as the agency of Christ operating at a distance; on the contrary, they are connected with *His being present on the earth*, and for this very reason they form a *coming to His people* (ch. xiv. 18): "I will not leave you comfortless; I will come to you." Although to the world I may be invisible, yet *ye* shall see me: for I live, although I am away from you; and, in virtue of this higher life, *ye* shall see me divinely present. These discourses point to *the spiritual coming of Christ* as the main point; but at the same time a reference to the appearance of the risen Christ is not excluded. It is involved in this coming of Christ that He and the communion with Him would be then first rightly manifested (ch. xvi. 16–19, xiv. 19–21): indeed, by His so coming and manifesting Himself spiritually, He, in virtue of His oneness with the Father, thus deals with His abiding with His people (ch. xiv. 23); but only with those who love Him and keep His words.

But the supernatural action of Jesus is not confined to beneficial operations proceeding from Him within *αἰὼν οὗτος*: He also ascribes to Himself in His glorified state another beneficial work, —namely, the *resurrection of the dead* (in distinction from the communication of true life, *ζωὴ αἰώνιος*), and, indeed, *ἐν ἑσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ* (John v. 28, vi. 39, 40, 44, 54). It is limited as such to the faithful, in distinction from whom the *φάῦλα πράξαντες* have the *ἀνάστασις κρίσεως*, which is likewise His action, all judgment being committed to Him (ch. v. 22). As an agency of Christ for the *completion of salvation* is herein supposed, it is described as a coming, a *return of Christ*, *πάλιν ἔρχομαι* (John xiv. 3):¹ "I will receive you unto myself," which, according to xvii. 24 and xii. 32, is to be distinguished from the coming to His disciples, which we have already considered. This coming to receive His people into the heavenly glory is also understood in ch. xxi. 22 (cf. 1 John ii. 28, iv. 17). This completion of salvation is effected by Jesus, not merely as a matter extraneous to Himself, but in that He, who has life in Himself, is the resurrection and

¹ The term *παρουσία* does not occur in John's Gospel.—Tr.

the life,—that is, is the principle of all life, even of that which overcomes death ; and the full beatification of His people is consequently nothing but the full reception into His essence.

We must remark, that Jesus has not expressly represented His work under the *type of the threefold office* ; but as in certain utterances He has applied to Himself the designation of *prophet* or *king*, and has indirectly described Himself as one who offered Himself in a *priestly* way, He has thus in His discourses implanted the fruitful germ for the further development of this doctrine.

As far as the people were concerned, the name of a *prophet* might be the more readily applied to Himself by Jesus, since the nature of His ministry during His public career presented a similarity to the Old Testament prophetic functions, to an extent which was surprising to the people themselves (cf. § 15). Thus the people themselves called Him a prophet (Matt. xi. 11 ; Luke vii. 16 ; John vi. 14, iv. 19), the idea of the Messiah being included in that of a prophet. We nevertheless find that Jesus did not usually apply this name to Himself, because He was unwilling to give an opportunity for placing Him on a like footing with the Old Testament prophets ; indeed, He said of John that he was more than a prophet, because he did not predict the appearance of the Messiah as something future, but preached it as that which had already taken place (Matt. xi. 9). Thus, as regards Himself, He must even more have had the idea that He was not so much a prophet as the fulfiller of prophecy, as He who had come to fulfil both the law and the prophets (Matt. v. 17), and came into the vineyard, not as the servant of the lord, but as the heir of the whole theocratical preparation. We have, however, an expression in which Jesus classes Himself in general among the prophets. We must, nevertheless, allow that the words have somewhat of a proverbial character, and might possibly be used in a case where, strictly speaking, a prophet was not in question (Matt. xiii. 57 ; Mark vi. 4 ; Luke iv. 24). We see, however, from Luke iv. 25, 26, that Jesus in this passage compares Himself to the ancient prophets, and hence even His disciples acknowledged Him as such (Luke xxiv. 19). The substance of the enunciation of the prophetic office is implied in His whole teaching in connection with His miracles and predictions, and His typical life. He continues this office in His exalted state by means of the Spirit whom He sends (John xiv. 26). So far as the Lord made known

in God's name the divine will as the willing of salvation, and executed it in God's good time, and in conformity with His arrangement, He was a prophet; but so far as He completes the whole work of salvation, as He who was determined to be the real bringer about of it, He is, indeed, far above all prophesying.

The case is the same with the *priesthood*. Jesus nowhere calls Himself a priest; but, in the sense in which He is called a high priest in Heb. ii. 17, iv. 14, He represents His ministry, especially His sufferings and death, as expiatory,—this being implied in John xvii. 19. In this He is at the same time both priest and sacrifice; and His priesthood culminates as the priesthood of Him who offers Himself as the holy and sinless One, as the gift altogether well-pleasing to the Father, and thus sanctifies Himself for His people, so that they may be sanctified in the truth. The same thing is implied in Matt. xx. 28. His life is a *λύτρον*, as it also was an atoning sacrifice for the sinner, in which the general idea of substitution is conveyed, although not the specifically juridical idea. The introductory words to the Lord's Supper (Matt. xxvi. 28) also belong to this idea of the priesthood, inasmuch as the blood shed for the forgiveness of sins bears a reference to the shedding of blood in the sacrifice.

The idea and title of *king* is, on the other hand, expressly applied to Himself by Jesus. It is quite openly conveyed in the parabolic representation of His judicial kingly action as the Messiah (Matt. xxv. 34). He also directly names Himself a king in answer to Pilate's question (John xviii. 37), and as the accused, in the midst of His deepest humiliation, reveals His kingly eminence,—certainly, though, as a king whose kingdom is not of earth but of heaven. With this, too, must be classed all that He does in founding, maintaining, and guiding a community, to which the promise is given that the gates of hell shall not prevail against it: the choice of His disciples (John xv. 16, 19, vi. 70), the infinite power of drawing men unto Him which He exercises, and the dispositions for His Church (John xv. 12; Matt. x. 5 ff., xviii. 15–20, xxviii. 19, 20).

The teaching of Jesus, therefore, contains the germ of the later doctrine of the threefold office, the root of which is found in the Old Testament.

§ 35. *The Teaching as to the Operation of Redeeming Power—In general.*

It was to be expected that Jesus would describe His redeeming action under *two different aspects*, the operation, even during His life, being a twofold one; hence He contrasts the two (John iii. 16–19). Here, indeed, it is expressly said that He had not come to judge the world; but, as some men loved darkness rather than light, and proved it to Him effectively by their moral actions, He it is who must judge them. Justice must be done on sin; and this takes place either through a sentence of condemnation on the individual; or, by the latter resigning himself to redemption, sin is judged, and, its liability to punishment being recognised by him, is thrust out. *This judgment* is sometimes considered by Jesus as a future matter, sometimes (especially in John) more as belonging to the present time; but the idea is not excluded, that the judgment now commencing may be concluded at a future time (John v. 29; cf. Mark xvi. 16; Matt. xxv. 31, 32, 46). In John xii. 31, xvi. 11, it is declared that the prince of this world—*ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου*—shall be judged and cast out. The *judgment on the world* is, in fact, constituted by Satan (its chief in its separation from God) being driven out by power from his position as *ἄρχων*. In ch. xii. 31 this is, indeed, described as a matter belonging to the present time, but so described that it is not spoken of as taking place at that very moment, but as an event to be expected. Thus, towards the end of His farewell discourse (John xvi. 11), the Lord says that when the Comforter is come, He will judge the world, *περὶ ἁμαρτίας, δικαιοσύνης, and κρίσεως*,—the latter, because the prince of this world is judged. The fact, in the first place, depends on the life, death, resurrection, and glorification of Christ.

In these events is involved the judgment which befalls Satan; and, according to John xiv. 30, it befalls him exactly so far as he has nothing in Jesus, the Son of God and Saviour of the world. Although Jesus had entered into the sinful world and had lived the life of man, yet in the final catastrophe of His life all claim on Him is cut off. In this victory the world is likewise overcome, so that the disciples can no longer fear it (John xvi. 33). Through this judgment, however, the world and its prince are excluded from all communion with Christ, and the separation

expressed in John iii. 18, 19, is fulfilled, which is of course not completely carried out until the coming judgment, but yet only under the condition of its successive realization in the course of the world's development. These utterances in St. John's Gospel must be compared with Luke x. 18, 19: in this passage is shown the judgment which will come upon this enemy. It is a victory over him, but is based upon a moral and judicial relation (cf. Matt. xii. 28, 29). The kingdom of God is that which subdues the power of the wicked, in Satan and in all those who persist in sin. The destruction of those wonderful operations of Satanic agency among men, which are so much spoken of in the Synoptists, forms an especial effect of this victory.

But the aim of the Lord, as far as the world is concerned, is a twofold one, *κατακριθῆναι* and *σωθῆναι* (Luke viii. 12; Mark xvi. 16; John iii. 17, v. 34, xvi. 9, cf. 11, xvii. 2, vi. 40, 47).

The *being saved* is a salvation in order to *live*; cf. *ζωὴ αἰώνιος* or *ζωή* (Matt. vii. 14; Luke x. 28; Matt. xviii. 8, 9; Luke xviii. 18), and *ἀναζήν* (Luke xv. 24, 32). This idea was subsequently current among the apostles under the name *σωτηρία*, which, however, is also used by the Lord (John iv. 22; Luke xix. 9; cf. Matt. xviii. 11; Luke i. 77). *Life* is the essence of *salvation*. It had been already so considered in the Old Testament, in which it was looked upon as the result of the fulfilment of the law (Lev. xviii. 5; Gal. iii. 11, 12; Luke x. 28; cf. Hab. ii. 4). This usage of the word *life*, as implying a condition of salvation and an internal and external harmony with and friendly relation to God, has been appropriated by Jesus in order to describe that life which, by His means, falls to the share of believers. The contrast to it is the New Testament idea that sin and its corruption are *death* (cf. John vi. 50, 51, xi. 25, 26). It is called *ζωὴ αἰώνιος*, because, although originating in temporal life, yet, as springing from God, it outlasts it. In the Synoptists, as "eternal life," it is looked upon as a future matter (Luke xviii. 18), although there are some passages which refer it to the present time, such as Luke xv. 24, 32, or in ix. 60, where believers are taken to be *living*, in contrast to the spiritually dead. In St. John also, although more stress is laid on its application to the present time, yet its completion is altogether looked upon as a future matter (John xiv. 19, 20). This life, therefore, falls to the lot of believers (so that they have it *ἐν ἑαυτοῖς*, John vi. 53) through

Christ, because He hath the fulness of life in Him (John xiv. 6), and hath overcome death (xi. 25), on account of which He calls Himself the *ἀνάστασις*.

For this very reason He closely connects His own life with that of the believers in Him (John xiv. 19); and thus this subjective idea of life merges into the more objective aspect of the community of life with Christ. Thus, eminently, in John it is a "being in Christ and Christ in us" (John xiv. 20), and therefore a coming of Christ to us and an abiding with us (John xvii. 23, xiv. 23, xv. 4, 7), in which, without detracting from the individuality of the two, the most intimate unity of life exists (cf. John xiv. 23, 21). This communion with Christ is *not merely a moral oneness of sentiment*, for it does not consist merely in love to Him and keeping His commandments, nor merely in being loved by Christ and enjoying His love; according to John xiv. 21, 23, all these things are distinguished by the Lord from the promise that He would come to His people and make His abode with them (cf. vers. 28, 19, 20). It is more analogous to the oneness of Christ with the Father (cf. ch. xvii. 11, 23). For this very reason it is not a mere oneness of sentiment which is in question, but *they are in Christ and in the Father* (ver. 21). It depends on the communication of the Spirit; and all that He conveys is given by the Father (ch. xiv. 16, 17, 26). It is consequently a *participation in the life of Christ*, and in the innermost *power of life*, which in believers is the same as in Christ, being communicated from Him to them. Communion with Christ includes the enjoyment of the love of Christ (ch. xv. 9), under the condition that we abide in His love by following His commandments and His example (vers. 9, 10). Hence it also includes the perfect joy of Christ (ver. 11): it is the joy which He Himself has and gives. Finally, we may also gather that communion with Christ is also *communion with the Father and with the Spirit*, as results from the oneness of the Father with the Son and with the Spirit.

The communion with Christ is thus represented to us in our Lord's utterances in St. John's Gospel. In the Synoptists we have passages which come very near, and are allied to these, but none that are identical. We find in them, at all events, the promise of a divine and efficacious presence of Jesus among His people (Matt. xviii. 20, xxviii. 20); and figuratively (Matt. xii. 46-50, especially vers. 49 and 50; cf. Mark iii. 31-35; Luke

viii. 19-21), with those who keep His word, Jesus stands in the relation of an intimate communion of spirit, similar to the natural affinity with a mother, brother, or sister. He assures this peculiar affinity with Him to those who fulfil the will of His Father. Connected with this, too, is the coming of men to Christ (Matt. xi. 28), to which He invites all those who are weary and heavy-laden. In Luke vi. 47 (cf. John v. 40, vi. 35, 37, 44) we have the movement of the individual towards Christ represented as a union with Him; and in Matt. xi. 28 (cf. vers. 29, 30) the coming is in the sense of the union with Him, which subordinates the subject to Him, thereby procuring rest.

The previous matter we have considered contains the *general* points which are realized in a certain special *order of salvation*: this includes (1) the *calling*, (2) the *commencement* of salvation, (3) its *progress and completion*. The *order of salvation* generally is not mentioned expressly in the utterances of the Lord, although the Lord speaks of the way in which men are to walk, and the gate into which they are to enter (Matt. vii. 13, 14). Indeed, He describes Himself as the way, and the only way, by which man cometh to the Father (John xiv. 6). These three distinct effects of His mission may, however, be gathered readily enough from His discourses. They may be found combined and expressly distinguished in John vi. 44: the "drawing" forms a part of the *calling*, and this is followed by the *coming* as the commencement, and the resurrection as the completion of salvation.

§ 36. *The Teaching as to the Operation of Redceming Power—The Calling.*

The *calling* is the requisite condition, without which no one can attain salvation and life. The Lord, in speaking of it, uses the expression *καλεῖν* (Matt. ix. 13; Mark ii. 17; Luke v. 32), *to call to repentance*. On this point, however, we must specially consider the three parables which speak of the *calling* and its results. In them, by the two figures of the *wedding-feast* and the *vineyard*, the kingdom of God is represented to us in its twofold aspect, as *a good to be enjoyed*, and also as *a sphere of work and duty* (Matt. xxii. 2-14; Luke xiv. 16-23; Matt. xx. 1-16). Added to this, we may discern other figurative modes of expressing this idea, such as the *gathering together His people* as a hen gathers her chickens (Matt. xxiii. 37; Luke xiii. 34); the

seeking after that which is lost (Luke xv. 4, 8; Matt. xviii. 11-14). There is also a peculiar expression used in Matt. xxviii. 19, *μαθητεύειν*, to *make into disciples*. The idea implied in these expressions is that of a divine act, sometimes of God the Father (as distinguished from the Son), who, through His servants, causes an invitation to be given (Matt. xxii. 2, 3); sometimes it is Christ Himself who is the caller (Matt. ix. 13, and parallel passages) during His earthly career, by means of the prophetic office which devolved upon Him in His humiliation. Thus He especially calls the apostles, though in this it may be said that God, as the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, is the caller by means of Christ's words. But God the Father can also call in a direct way: the "drawing" and "giving" in John vi. 37, 39, 44, 65, are in connection with this.

The act of calling is both *internal* and *external*: external as the historical knowledge of Christ and His work, of the historical Christ. It is, in the first place, a *calling through the word*. In John xvii. 20 the Lord says that He prays for all who, through the word, believe on Him. Thus, in the above-named parables, the word is set forth as the word of invitation to men. Hence the great importance of the word in the representation of its effects (Matt. xiii. 19-23), and the charge to the disciples to preach it (Matt. xxviii. 19; Mark xvi. 15). But the word of calling reaches the consciousness of individuals under certain *circumstances*, which *modify its impression*. The influence of these belongs to the calling as much as the sending of the word and its instruments. Of this kind are the circumstances which surrounded the prodigal son, and induced him to come to himself (Luke xvi. 14-17). These circumstances are an element of the external calling, which, however, is thus rendered internal. Many of the utterances of Jesus are so generally framed, that they may be referred to both aspects of the calling, although in the first place they suggest the internal side; thus John vi. 44 f., 65. The *being taught by God* is the internal call, by which the Father gives a man to the Son, or causes him to come to Him. This drawing is an act of the Father; but in John xii. 32 the Son says that He Himself possesses equally with the Father this power of attraction, within reach of which we must come in order to be among those that are called. It takes effect through the word and the whole situation of the person acted on, and is

essentially an internal bias, only that by it the matter is not yet decided.

The *calling* assumes, indeed, *different degrees*, as shown in Luke xiv. 16–23, where the stringency culminates in ver. 23; but even here it is a cogent call, and not force, which is spoken of. But, notwithstanding these degrees, the calling is, on the one hand, always impressively intended, as in the two parables, and in that of the vineyard, and, on the other, never of a compulsory character, and is therefore subject to the reply of man, as in the parable of the vineyard.

The calling is a *general* one, and according to the nature of redeeming mercy, which consists in assisting from motives of love those that are lost (Matt. xviii. 11–14; cf. Matt. ix. 13; Luke v. 32, according to which, Christ calls *sinners*). Therefore the love of God working in Him embraces the entire *κόσμος* (John iii. 16). The calling, consequently, applies to all nations without distinction,—to the Gentiles equally with the Jews (Matt. xxviii. 19; Mark xvi. 15); cf. the assurance as to the participation of the Gentiles in the kingdom of God (Matt. viii. 11, xxiv. 14, xxvi. 13; John x. 16). Other passages, which appear to limit the calling and to exclude the Gentiles, are only intended to express that the Lord had to limit His personal ministry as Messiah to the theocratic people first of all (Matt. xv. 24, generally vers. 21–28; Mark vii. 24–30; Matt. x. 5–7; Luke x. 2). But the calling deals with individuals *in succession*. This idea in its general character is expressed in Matt. xx. 2–16. The succession itself is set forth in Luke xiv. 16–23, especially in vers. 16, 17, 21, 23. The first are those who have had among them since ancient times a system of national guidance: to them first the call came, because in them the requisite conditions of recognition and acceptance were inherent; when they rejected the invitation, the succession goes on to those who are inferior in claim.

In respect to those who accept the call, the calling is to be considered as a *choosing*. This choosing, as God's act, is only once mentioned, and then, indeed, quite generally (Mark xiii. 20); in which, however, it is to be assumed that the ideal eternal act of God is meant, the temporal effect of which is the calling,—just as the choosing in the apostolical teaching, especially in Paul, is not the temporal *καλέιν*, by which those accepting the call are actually severed from the complex of the *κόσμος*. We are speci-

ally pointed to this everlasting act in Matt. xxv. 34, in which it is said that for those who are blessed of the Father the βασιλεία is ἡτοιμασμένη from the foundation of the world. "The elect" are often spoken of (Luke xviii. 7; Matt. xxiv. 22, 24, 31; Mark xiii. 20, 22; cf. Ps. cv. 43; Isa. lxxv. 22; Rom. viii. 33; Col. iii. 12). By these, however, are always meant those who are called and really accept the call (Matt. xxii. 14), inwardly apprehending the word (Luke viii. 15; Matt. xiii. 23); but those, especially, who are distinguished and first among them. For even among those who accept the call, there is, according to Matt. xx. 16, a distinction of degrees. When, therefore, a man accepts the call, everything that he is, becomes, has, and receives, is to be referred to the eternal act of God: it has been prepared by the Father (Matt. xx. 23, xxv. 34).

§ 37. *The Teaching as to the Operation of Redeeming Power—The Commencement of Salvation.*

The general idea of an alteration of the mind or spiritual being is treated of didactically by the Lord in the Gospel of John only. The principal passage is that concerning *regeneration* (John iii. 3–8), by which may be placed the more general utterance, John v. 21, as to the ζωοποιεῖν. In both passages salvation is treated of under the idea of life: in the former, of regeneration and an entry into life; in the latter, as the quickening of those who are dead. For the Lord, by comprehending salvation in the idea of life, places the whole of His positive agency in *making alive*. This is followed in ver. 22 by the mention of the *judgment* which these incur who do not believe, and therefore will not receive life like those who accept the word (ver. 24). The passing from death unto life is represented in John iii. 3–8 under the figure of a new birth. In this, not only is life opposed to death, but the new life is compared with the old in respect to its quality, life with life. Even in John v. something of a similar character is indeed implied in the idea of ζωὴ αἰώνιος as contrasted with transitory life. This birth is a birth of the Spirit,—more accurately, of water and the Spirit (John iii. 5),—just as ἐκ Θεοῦ (John i. 13; 1 John iv. 7, v. i. 4). The Divine Spirit is the breath of life, corresponding to the incorruptible seed from which, according to 1 Pet. i. 23, the new life springs. Some have looked upon this twofold origin (water and the Spirit) as an ἐν διὰ δυοῖν; or it has been thought

that the *πνεῦμα* was to be understood literally, and the *ῥῥωρ* symbolically. But why is the water symbolically added? The idea of purification is not sufficient to explain this satisfactorily. Or it is said that regeneration may be compared with the arising of a new existence (1 Pet. i. 23); and as in Tit. iii. 5 the water or the washing of regeneration may be taken in reference to baptism, so here the water is to be understood according to the analogy of the account of the creation (Gen. i. 1-3), regeneration being called a new creation in 2 Cor. v. 17. The water would then be the element to be formed, the Spirit the forming element. But creation is not a matter in question here. The comparison with 1 Pet. i. 23, and also the figure itself, point rather to natural generation; the latter results *ἐκ σαρκὸς καὶ αἵματος* (cf. John i. 13); with the latter the Lord now contrasts a twofold expression for the cause of the spiritual generation, in which the *ῥῥωρ* forms the antithesis to the *αἷμα*, the purifying to the contaminating element. In this, too, there is a hint conveyed that the Spirit causes a new life in an already existing subject, and that this is possible only by the latter being purified; so that the Spirit acts not only with a *quickening* power, which is inherent in Him, but also with a *purifying* effect, as shown by the addition of water. In both respects the freshly flowing and purifying water in baptism is a symbol of the Spirit. In this passage the Lord alludes quite evidently to baptism, although not at present to the baptism instituted by Him. But He might indeed refer to its precursor, the baptism of John. John the Baptist is indeed spoken of in this chapter. He was still exercising his prophetic ministry, and in Jerusalem it was not out of place to speak of him. Jesus might well hope that this allusion would be understood by Nicodemus, and that He could thus lead him to all that He Himself intended. In this, therefore, we have the second reason for the conjunction of the *ῥῥωρ* with the *πνεῦμα*. This new birth expresses an *entire change in a spiritual respect*, an *entirely new vital power* being infused by the Spirit; in it the true life is implanted, not, indeed, by man, but by God as the only author. The alteration itself is, however, accompanied by pangs, as is indeed implied in the figure. The two ideas of regeneration and of passing from death unto life are, however, retained by the apostles, and further developed by them. In the Synoptists we find no utterances on the point which are

entirely identical with those in St. John. There are, however, some which are closely allied, and seem to allude to the two ideas expressed in the fourth gospel. In them, also, the state of the sinner is looked upon as a state of death (Luke ix. 60); and in Luke xv. 24, 32, it is said of the prodigal son that he had been dead and was alive again. Likewise the language in Matt. xviii. 3, Mark x. 14, and Matt. xix. 14, corresponds with the idea of regeneration. By this a *conversion* and *becoming like little children* are laid down as a necessary condition for entering into the kingdom of God. In these passages a mighty change, at all events, is implied,—indeed, the *becoming a new man*. Everything belonging to the former development of the man is to be given up, and a new development must be begun, and the man must thus assume the receptive character of a child. Yet this idea does not go so far as regeneration. The above-named change refers only to the moment of childhood, consequently to the beginning of the natural life; but regeneration, as the beginning of an *entirely new* life, goes much further. Added to this, the alteration is removed entirely from any human causality and is transferred to the divine agency. The synoptical view is, however, supplemented by another passage, Matt. xix. 26, in which the entry into God's kingdom, which, under certain circumstances, seemed impossible to men, is declared to be possible to the divine omnipotence. But this is not directly applied to the conversion to a child-like state, as in regeneration,—the possibility of a return to this state through divine grace being only presupposed. The same idea is, however, expressed in Matt. v. 6, where the satisfaction of those who hunger and thirst after righteousness is represented as being the divine gift.

The commencement of salvation is both a *change of mind* and also a *reversion of the relation towards God*. The idea of the commencement of salvation being that of an entry into life, the call of God is become a quickening, regenerating influence. The change in the spiritual being of man, which is implied therein, is contained in the figure of the new birth. But the alteration in the relation to God is conveyed by the idea of being sought and found by God or Christ (Matt. xviii. 12–14; Luke xv. 4 ff., xix. 10), of being exalted, of not coming into judgment, and of the forgiveness of sins. These two points are dealt with by the Lord in the most various ways,—not scholastically, but freely touched upon, although always consistently with the fundamental idea.

They are, for instance, comprehended in the figure of the strait gate and the narrow way (Matt. vii. 13 ; Luke xiii. 24), which denotes the entry into the way of salvation, or the way of life, but at the same time describes it as a change of mind.

The new life of man in itself, the change of mind and conversion, or the altered feeling and conduct in a moral respect, is styled by our Lord *μετανοεῖν* (Matt. iv. 17 ; Mark i. 15 ; Luke xv. 7, 10), *ἐπιστρέφειν* (Luke xxii. 32), *στραφῆναι* (Matt. xviii. 3), *μεταμέλεσθαι* (Matt. xxi. 29). This disposition of mind has two elements which everywhere recur, *repentance* and *believing*, as the negative and positive poles of this new life.

The first element of this double condition of the heart, or two-fold feeling, *repentance*, is very characteristically and copiously laid down in the beginning of the Sermon on the Mount, in the Beatitudes (Matt. v. 3), with which should be compared Matt. xi. 28. The Lord declares the blessedness of the poor in spirit who are conscious of their poverty, and invites the weary and heavy-laden to come unto Him. Repentance, therefore, is self-humiliation. It is, besides, depicted in its inward disposition as a lively consciousness of personal sin, and a candid repentance for the same (Luke xv. 17, 21, 28), in which also the need for deliverance is expressed as a lively longing for God's succour. For him who has not done his Father's will, there is no other way to be saved but a conversion of this kind (Matt. xxi. 28 ff.). As regards the discourses in St. John, it is, in general, a peculiarity in them that they bring more prominently forward the positive idea, and represent regeneration as a positive act. There is, however, no deficiency in the ideas belonging to the subject. Thus, for instance, the idea of the *διψᾶν* (John vii. 37 ; cf. Matt. v. 6). Also, in John iii. 20, 21, he that perseveres in sin is indeed worthy of the *ἐλεγχθῆναι*, but he avoids it ; but others who do not persevere in their sin do not avoid it, and, on the contrary, place themselves in the light, and allow themselves to be enlightened by it, and thus suffer the *ἐλεγχθῆναι* ; as Paul says, " If we judge ourselves, we shall not be judged " (1 Cor. xi. 31). Repentance being, in the first place, the opposition to sin and the turning away from it, it is also the giving up of the sinful life in order to attain one of an opposite character ; consequently the surrender of the lower life in order to gain the soul (Matt. x. 39, xvi. 25 ; Luke xvii. 33 ; John xii. 25). The confession of sin

also belongs to it (Luke xv. 21); also the firm rejection of darling sins in which a man has lived (John v. 14; Matt. v. 29), and a complete renunciation of them, added to every possible restitution of any wrong done (Luke xix. 8), and a ready assumption of the difficult duty of self-denial.

The *μετανοεῖν* is placed by the Lord in connection with the *πιστεύειν*; but the *believing* consists in the coming to Christ of him that is drawn by God (John vi. 44, cf. 64), and, on coming to Christ, in being accepted by Him (John vi. 37). Thus it is a work to which man is summoned by God (John vi. 29), a drawing near to Christ (Matt. xi. 28), a self-resignation to Him, and, consequently, a laying hold of Him with confidence. This agrees with the signification of *πίστις*, which is equivalent to *trust, confidence*, which fundamental meaning not only corresponds with *יִסְתָּא*, but is also corroborated by the prevailing mode of construction in the utterances of the Lord, with the dative (John v. 24; Matt. xxi. 25); with *ἐπὶ* = to rely on anything (Luke xxiv. 25); with *ἐν* (Mark i. 15), because belief as confidence has found a resting-point; with *εἰς* (John iii. 15, vi. 29, 35, vii. 38, ix. 35; Matt. xviii. 6). The noun *πίστις* itself does not occur so frequently in the gospels as in the epistles; but, where it does occur, it is made equivalent to *trust*,—that is, in Christ (Luke xviii. 8, xxii. 32, viii. 48, vii. 50; Matt. viii. 10, ix. 2; Mark iv. 40). None of the other derivations have more in their favour; least of all those which go on the idea of the signification of *honesty of conviction*; or those which take the meaning to be *a believing to be true*. But it cannot be denied that there are passages in which this meaning appears to prevail: it is so in the construction with the accusative (*τοῦτο*, John xi. 26), or with *ὅτι* (John ix. 18, viii. 24, xi. 27, 42, xiii. 19, etc.). In these passages prominence is given to a special point in faith, as the tendency of the entire man and of the heart towards God or Christ. This point is the strong impression of a matter being true. Olshausen explains *faith*, as occurring in the gospels, to be the *susceptibility of reception* of the power proceeding from Christ. But faith must not be limited to this: the reception itself being also an attribute of it, the mere susceptibility does not go far enough. Where the *πίστις* exists, there is an actual acceptance of Christ. But, of course, according to the connection, it may be perhaps only incipient and partial. Other expressions for the idea of faith may be found in the utter-

ances of the Lord, especially in John. The sheep hear His voice (John x. 27, cf. vers. 26, 16, 4, 3, and viii. 43, as a contrast). The idea of *following* (John x. 27) implies something further; but the hearing and perceiving the voice of Christ form a part of faith; so also *γινώσκειν* (John xvii. 3). The idea of faith certainly appears in the evangelists to be to some extent a flexible one. It has various grades; and is sometimes incipient, and sometimes progressive and conclusive, according to the persons with whom the Lord had to deal. Sometimes, indeed, faith appears as a gradually suscipient principle of this kind, even in regard to various divine powers and gifts, as the gift of bodily healing (Luke viii. 48, xvii. 19; Matt. viii. 13; John iv. 50). But as all bodily suffering is only the result of sin, and bodily healing is only an offshoot of the spiritually redeeming agency, and an anticipation of the future redemption from all evil, faith also is, indeed, the necessary condition for experiencing the benefits of this divine power. But it refers essentially to the spiritually redeeming power of Christ (this being expressly stated in Luke vii. 50), and therefore to salvation generally, and to eternal life (John iii. 15, vi. 40), and to its future consummation in the *ἀνάστασις* (John xi. 25, 26).

Thus repentance on the one hand, and faith on the other, or, combined in one idea, penitent faith, appears to be the condition necessary for salvation, and the characteristic of the new life. And, in this sense, the gate spoken of in Matt. vii. 13, 14, is at the same time both the condition and the life itself, because in this change of mind the new spiritual life is subjectively supposed.

But, in another aspect, this new life is also a *change in the relation to God*. Guilt, and the liability to punishment, and the pressure of sin, no longer weigh heavily on the new man: his *sins are forgiven*; he is justified. The usual phrase for this relation is the *ἄφεσις τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν* (Matt. xxvi. 28; Luke xxiv. 47), an expression derived from the Old Testament (cf. Mark i. 4; Luke i. 77); *ἀφιέναι τὰς ἁμαρτίας* (Matt. ix. 2, 5, 6; Luke vii. 47-49, xi. 4; John xx. 23); . . . *ἁμαρτίαν* (Matt. xii. 31, 32); *τὰ ὀφειλήματα* (Matt. vi. 12); *ἄφ. τὰ παραπτώματα* (Matt. vi. 14, 15); *ἄφ. τινί* (Luke xxiii. 34, xii. 10; Matt. xviii. 21, 35); and *ἄφεσις* alone (Mark iii. 29; cf. Heb. ix. 22). These expressions refer to the abolition of the relation to God which is brought about by sin, and, in the first place, to its direct negative. It is the abrogation

of the relation of guilt before God, especially of the consciousness of guilt and liability to punishment in God's sight. Under this aspect it may be compared with the parable of the great debtor (Matt. xviii. 23 ff.; cf. Luke vii. 41, 42). The positive element in the idea is the restoration of a harmonious relation to God, as befits a *righteous man* or a *child of God*; cf. *δικαιοῦσθαι* (Luke xviii. 14, cf. ver. 13). It is worthy of remark that it is Luke who retains this expression,—the companion of the apostle who so specially uses the expression, and has developed the idea. Always in the New Testament, and almost always in the Old Testament, *δικαιοῦν* is equivalent to *declaring to be righteous, and treating any one as such*. *Δικαιοῦν ἑαυτόν* (Luke xvi. 15), to justify oneself, to hold oneself to be righteous, is an unwarrantable self-exaltation, which is an abomination before God; but lowering oneself in a free acknowledgment of guilt and corruption, humiliating oneself, and beseeching God for His forgiving mercy, these things constitute the way of elevating the sinner who is worthy of condemnation in God's sight,—that is, the way of freeing him from his sin. But the positive side, the transposition into the relation of a child of God, is presented in the parable of the lost son, in which the result of forgiveness is fully depicted (Luke xv. 20–24). Therefore the restoration into the position of a child, which position has been lost by sin, is, like justification, an expression for the positive element in the matter. Other descriptions of this also occur, such as the *finding of that which is lost*, although there is really something more involved in this, namely, the idea of being renewed and sanctified. The idea of the forgiveness of sins is less frequently brought forward in St. John, because he chiefly specifies those utterances in which redemption is described in its positive element (thus John xvii. 13); so also the *having eternal life*, and *not being lost* (John iii. 18, 16, v. 24), and other things of a figurative nature, as the *thirsting no more* (John iv. 14). The negative view is not, however, entirely wanting; on the contrary, we have the remission of sins expressly mentioned in John xx. 23,—mentioned, indeed, as a part of the apostolical commission, and therefore brought forward in a very important way.

To the inquiry as to what the Lord lays down as the *condition required for the remission of sins and justification*, the answer must be *faith based on repentance*. This is decidedly the case in the Synoptists, and also in John. The praying publican went

down to his house justified (Luke xviii. 14); and this is attributed by the Lord to his frame of mind, which was contrasted with the self-righteousness of the Pharisee, and the latter's sanctity and accompanying contempt for others. This frame of mind consisted in a penitent disposition, and a trusting apprehension of God's mercy, joined to a desire of salvation. We must also specially class with this the frame of mind of the prodigal son when he returned to his father. In addition to these parables, which contain the general idea, but are without any reference to the person and work of Christ, we have also more definite statements, in which the latter are included, as the Lord's treatment of Zacchæus (Luke xix. 1-10), and, more decidedly still, His words in reference to the woman that was a sinner (Luke vii. 37 ff., 50). We find in her, in addition to faith accompanied by bitter sorrow for sin, the intimate adhesion of the heart to the Redeemer. This is contrasted with the feelings of Simon the Pharisee, of whom it is shown, in ch. vii. 39-47, that he imagined himself to be very superior to the sinful woman, and manifested evident zeal for the law of God, but also that he was less susceptible of salvation than the woman, because he was deficient in a deep recognition of sin and desire for redemption, and, consequently, in attachment to the person of the Lord. Lastly, we find the same feeling in the thief who was crucified with Christ, who, with deep confession of his sins, turns in faith to Jesus. Again, it is worthy of remark that all these passages occur in Luke, the companion of Paul. We may perceive from this, that to him these narratives appeared specially characteristic, and hence his selection of them assumes a particular significance. Utterances of this kind are not, however, wanting in the other Synoptists: cf. the passage Matt. ix. 11-13, and the parallels, in which the *ἀμαρτωλοί* are those who feel themselves to be such, the *δίκαιοι* being the *ὑποκρινόμενοι ἑαυτούς*; cf. also ch. xxi. 28-32, in which the self-righteous Pharisees are contrasted with sinners who finally attain to the way of repentance, so as to do God's will; also, ch. xxii. 11-14, where the wedding garment represents penitent faith, just as the Lord elsewhere accurately expresses it, that man is to be poor in spirit, and to hunger and thirst in spirit (Matt. v. 3, 6); also that, as weary and heavy-laden, he must come to the Lord (Matt. xi. 28-30). From this point of view, also, must we understand the state of mind of the paralytic person (Matt. ix. 2). John also

gives passages in which this stipulation is brought forward : thus ch. iii. 15, v. 24, ch. vi., and also ch. ix., in which faith is expressly mentioned or denoted ; cf. other passages in which this is not so plainly done (cf. vi. 37, iv. 14). Whoever allows himself to be drawn by the Father to the Son, and believes on Him, does not come into judgment, and has everlasting life ; that is, he obtains forgiveness of sins and justification. Thus, in the didactic discourses in St. John's Gospel, we find the same conditions for salvation : it is either repentance combined with faith, or faith combined with repentance.

There is also no need for perplexity, when we find the Lord laying down as a *condition for the forgiveness of sins*, sometimes *love to Him*, as in the case of the sinful woman (Luke vii. 47) ; sometimes a *readiness to forgive our fellow-men*, as in the Lord's Prayer (Matt. vi. 12) and similar expressions (Mark xi. 25, 26) ; or compassion towards them (Matt. v. 7). Sometimes on these occasions it is not the very first commencement of forgiveness of sins which is in question,—for how could any true love exist ere forgiveness had been generally obtained ? Still less is it the first beginning of love to Christ ; but it is in part believers who are spoken of, who must exercise this readiness to forgive if they are to remain in possession of the mercy shown them. Sometimes, however, it refers to that love to Christ and compassion to men which already exists and must exist in the various stages of repentance, and in this respect constitutes an obligation necessary for the forgiveness of sins ; as in the spiritual poverty of those to whom the kingdom of God is promised (Matt. v. 3), and also in the humility therein implied, must also be contained the inclination to gentleness and pity.

Just as little need it cause us any difficulty, when we find the Lord requiring, as a requisite for salvation, that we should do the will of His Father and follow His word (Matt. vii. 21). This stipulation is contrasted with the merely external, although zealous confession of Christ as the Lord (vers. 21, 22), which is combined with a perseverance in sin ; it is also contrasted with the *not following* His words (ver. 26). All that is comprehended in this will of God as regards the sinner, must, however, be deduced from other utterances of the Lord, especially the commencement of the Sermon on the Mount. According to this, it is not any action done in his own power which is to procure a man salvation ; for

it is the poor in spirit, he who hungers and thirsts after righteousness, who, by means outside himself, by God's power, is to be satisfied therewith. Hence the only *doing* intended is that which is contained in penitent faith.

Thus the condition requisite for the forgiveness of sins and justification is identical and simultaneous with the state which constitutes the new spiritual life. The two are mutually involved, and are one and the same thing. The joint idea is that of *righteousness* (Matt. v. 6, 20, vi. 33; John xvi. 8, 10). From a comparison of these passages, we may conclude that righteousness is an object of human desire, which can only be satisfied by a gift from above, through the divine power, and not through any power of man himself. It is, therefore, the first object of the striving which is directed towards the entry into the kingdom of God; for in and with the latter it is given. This righteousness, which originally is peculiar to Christ (cf. 1 John ii. 1, 2), is that which becomes ours by our community with Him. And consequently the righteousness of the Christian, from the beginning onwards, is essentially a state of justification; but for this very reason it is not a presumptive but an actual righteousness,—one which avails before God, and, in spite of all closely clinging sin, meets with no condemnation.

§ 38. *The Teaching as to the Operation of Redeeming Power—The Progress and Completion of Salvation.*

Progress in a life of faith is, in the first place, a progress in *love to God and to Christ*, and for their sakes to *the brethren*. For as soon as faith relinquishes its receptive capacity, and stands out in independence, it must assume the character of love, and, indeed, of self-denying love. For as faith is manifested only in love, so can repentance only become active by self-denial. Thus Jesus speaks as to this love (Matt. x. 37 f.; cf. Luke xiv. 26). Repentance itself being a turning away from sin, self-denial must apply especially to everything sinful and also to everything which is an object of desire, and must follow the example of Jesus (John xii. 26; Matt. xx. 26–28; John xiii. 12–17). In this strict sense the Lord adopts the requirement of love to God before everything,—a requirement which had been already recognised in Deuteronomy as the purport of the old covenant (Matt. xxii. 36 ff.). In this sense He inculcates love to Himself

as obedience to His commandments (John xiv. 15), and gives a special prominence to mutual love among believers (John xv. 12). This following of Jesus, with a renunciation of everything opposed to Him, is developed by Him in several discourses, with more special detail in the Synoptists. This is especially the righteousness which is better than that of the scribes and Pharisees (Matt. v. 20),—a righteousness in spirit and in truth, in which the commandments are inwardly fulfilled (ch. v. 21 ff.). He develops it further in ch. vi., in reference to works of beneficence and charity (vers. 2–4); to praying (vers. 5–15); the exercise of self-denial (vers. 16–18); the whole direction of the human energy towards some eternal heavenly treasure, so that the whole heart has its existence in the future (vers. 19–23), without being divided in its aim (vers. 24–34). When a man is in this frame of mind, he judges himself and not his brethren (Matt. vii. 1–5); deals wisely with the sacred things entrusted to him, doing nothing without prayer (vers. 6–11); and in his treatment of his neighbour follows the tenor of all the Old Testament precepts (ver. 12). This is the course to the narrow way (Matt. vii. 13 f.), in which we must, indeed, be cautious against offences (ver. 15), but shall become rich in fruit (vers. 17, 18), and shall see that the fabric of our salvation is founded on a rock (vers. 24, 25). But the whole of this progress in the life of faith presupposes the existence of the *ὑπομονή*, the persistence in the new life (Luke viii. 15, cf. 13, 14).

The other aspect in the progress in the life of faith is the development of *blessedness* in God (John xvi. 22, xv. 11), and in prayer (John xvi. 24). The joy which Christ has and gives, abides in believers and becomes perfected in them: they remain in the love of Christ and the enjoyment of the same (John xvii. 13, 26); also in His peace, owing to the victory over the tribulation which is occasioned by the world (John xvi. 33). He can, therefore, offer to them rest and refreshment (Matt. xi. 28, 29), can pronounce them blessed (Matt. v. 3 ff.), and can call upon them to rejoice because their names are written in heaven (Luke x. 20). But the outward effects are not so much the subject of their joy as the fact that they are the special objects of the divine choice; and this guarantees the existence of humility in this joy. It is the peace of the kingdom of God which sets them free from all the cares of the world, so that all external matters appear to be a secondary consideration (Luke xii. 31).

The *completion of salvation* is placed by the Lord, not in the present world, but in a supernatural heavenly future (Luke xx. 35). This position, ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς (Matt. v. 12), in αἰὼν ἑκείνος, is looked upon by Him as the true life (Matt. xviii. 8, cf. vii. 13; John v. 29). It is an existence in the Father's house, in which His sacred presence is manifested, where there are many mansions (John xiv. 2); in the everlasting habitations (Luke xvi. 9), where the great and true riches will be first committed unto men as their own, in contrast to the good things of this lower life as trifling things and the mammon of unrighteousness (Luke xvi. 10-12). It is *a being* where Christ is (John xii. 26, xiv. 3, 4); a participation in the glory of the glorified Redeemer (John xvii. 24). As the ζῶῃ of believers generally, which is communicated to them by Christ, is the ζῶῃ of Christ, so will the perfected ζῶῃ be nothing but the real participation in the perfected ζῶῃ of the glorified Christ. The spiritual life communicated to believers by Christ proves itself to be ζῶῃ αἰώνιος by the victory over death (John xi. 25, 26, v. 24-29, x. 28-30). Our Lord does not so much point out death as the transition to this state (although death brings with it a mighty change), as rather, (1.) The resurrection at the last day. This is the aim and end of salvation (John vi. 40, 44), as the resurrection of life (John v. 29; Luke xx. 35, 36). Those who are thought worthy to become partakers in that αἰὼν, through the resurrection from the dead, cannot die any more: they are like the angels and the Son of God (Luke xx. 36; Matt. xxii. 30). This is the resurrection of the just (Luke xiv. 14). (2.) And also His advent for judgment (Matt. xxiv. 30).

But by our arrival at this point, and by our consideration of the progress and completion of salvation, we are naturally led to Christ's doctrine and teaching as to the kingdom of God.

III.—THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

§ 39. *Idea of the Divine Kingdom.*

The source of this *idea in the Old Testament dispensation* is a covenant made by God with man, from which was developed the idea of a theocracy, of a people or house of God (Num. xii. 7), of

a kingdom of kings and priests (Ex. xix. 6 ; applied in an ideal sense to Christians in 1 Pet. ii. 9), indeed of a theocracy under a monarchical form. Then follows the conception of an ideally real theocratic kingdom of the Messiah (cf. Isa. ii. 1-4 ; Mic. iv. 1 ff. ; Isa. xi. 12 ; Jer. xxiii. 5-8, xxxi. 31 ff., xxxii. 37 ff., xxxiii. 7 ff. ; Ezek. xxxiv. 23 ff., xxxvii. 24 ff.) ; until the express term, the kingdom to be set up by God, appears (Dan. ii. 44), in contrast to the universal human kingdom, as that which is to exist under the rule of the Messiah as the Son of man,—the kingdom of the saints (ver. 22). Lastly, in the Apocrypha (Wisdom x. 10) the βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ is brought forward. In addition to these prophetic passages, we have various theocratical or royal psalms, in which also the idea of the theocratic kingship and kingdom is expressed.

The Lord found the idea thus existing in His time (Luke i. 32 ff., xiv. 15 ; Mark xi. 10), certainly not always in the shape in which it is presented in the Old Testament ; but, by applying it in the first place to those who were waiting for salvation, He was able to presuppose purer notions of it than those that were prevalent. The Baptist also, at his appearance, speaks of a kingdom of heaven (Matt. iii. 2). As an idea which was not only a fertile one, but also, on the other hand, both plastic and ductile, *the Lord* went on to make it *the groundwork of His teaching*, in order, as occasion was thereby offered, to be the better able to speak of the Messianic order of things, and thus to refer to His own person,—in this way introducing and preparing for His ministry. He speaks of it especially in the synoptical passages, and, indeed, takes it as the chief purport of His teaching, describing the announcement of it as the duty of His mission (Luke iv. 43 ; cf. Matt. x. 7 ; Luke x. 9, 11). In St. John, also, the Lord speaks of the kingdom of God (ch. iii. 3, 5) in His conversation with Nicodemus, in which it is evident that, although in this gospel the Lord brings more prominently forward the subjective element in the new order of things, the corresponding objective idea of the kingdom is jointly entertained, indeed, as the fundamental idea which embraces both regeneration and the new life. The Lord also speaks of it in His trial before Pilate (John xviii. 33, 36, 37), in which He refers the whole of His peculiar attitude to the idea of the kingdom.

This kingdom of God, in the teaching of Jesus, has been very

variously understood. (1.) As the kingdom of Christ, to be expected in the future, in which He would solemnly return to judgment, and the last judgment would prove Him to be the Lord over quick and dead,—(a) without Himself having been able to fix the epoch of this kingdom; or, (b) with the definition of time, that this kingdom should become visible on earth, and should commence simultaneously with the destruction of Jerusalem. In regard to this, some have declared the utterances relating to the subject to be an accommodation to circumstances; others have referred them to Jewish expectations, which even Jesus entertained, and in regard to which He was deceived. (2.) Going to the opposite extreme, the kingdom of God has been also understood as being merely the Church of Christ on earth; and it has been thought that all the utterances relating to His coming again were to be interpreted figuratively as referring to the spread of Christianity. (3.) By an union of these two views, the kingdom of God is understood to be both present and future,—the dominion of the exalted Christ, which consists partly in the influence over the minds of men exercised by the word, partly in the guidance of the external destinies of the Church, partly in the rewards and punishments at the last judgment. In it, too, is perhaps recognised the kingdom of grace, the temporal institutions of religion, the kingdom of glory, and the future acts of judgment; adding, too, the idea that Jesus was only in error in fixing too close a proximity for His judgment.

We must distinguish the *pure definitions of the time* from the utterances as to the *nature* of the kingdom of God. With respect to the former, in several utterances, Jesus keeps to the general proposition that “the kingdom of God is at hand” (Matt. iv. 17; Mark i. 14, 15; Luke iv. 43). The same occurs in the directions to the disciples as to the purport of their first preaching (Matt. x. 7). This is the expression of the most general character, the ἤγγικε not saying precisely whether an *actual present* or only a *quite closely impending time* is meant. In other passages, however, the time is more accurately indicated; for He describes the kingdom of God (a) as *already begun at the then present time* (Matt. xii. 28; Luke xi. 20, 21). The starting-point of this kingdom is the appearance of John the Baptist (Matt. xi. 12; Luke xvi. 16): up to his time the Old Testament dispensation (ὁ νόμος καὶ οἱ προφῆται) lasted. By Jesus, in Matt. xi. 11, contrasting the

Baptist with the members of the kingdom of God, it may be perceived that the real commencement of this kingdom is connected with His person. It coincides with His appearance, because in it the kingly operation of His divine power of attraction commences. (b) But Jesus also describes it as *future* in the formula of His prayer (Matt. vi. 10), and also in other passages of a more prophetic character (Matt. xvi. 28; Mark ix. 1; Luke ix. 27, xvii. 24-30, xxi. 31; Matt. xxv. 1, 34; Mark xiv. 25; Luke xxii. 29, 30). In these varied representations of the time of God's kingdom an intimation is conveyed as to its *nature*. It is in its nature, on the one hand, something simply existing and eternal, and, on the other, something temporal, developing itself through various conditions. In Luke xvii. 21 the Lord evidently looks upon it as plainly existing. Whosoever has a share in it has it actually, and is in it; he stands in this eternal order of things; just as Jesus says in John, that a man through regeneration *enters into it* (John iii. 3, 5). The figures of the costly pearl and the treasure hid in a field (Matt. xiii.) also point to something which has existed from everlasting; for it is contained in the idea and will of God; it is pre-designed therein (Matt. xxv. 34), and has been prepared from the foundation of the world. In its appearance it takes the other aspect, and is developed in it (Mark iv. 26-29). It is like seed which a man casts into the earth, and, while he sleeps, the seed springs up, and the earth brings forth first the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear.

But according to the practical idea of it, the kingdom of God in the teaching of the Lord is a *divine order of things*, which is realized through Christ the Redeemer, as one developing itself from within. That it is a *divine order* of things, is clear from the declaration that it was not of this world (John xviii. 33-36); that the disciples do not belong to the world (John xv. 19); that he only who is of God hears His word (John viii. 47); it is in the world, but not of the world and sinful (John xvii. 15-21). It is, therefore, a disposition of divine origin and of a divine nature. Being realized through Christ, it is His kingdom (Luke xxii. 30; Matt. xvi. 18, xiii. 41); and the unveiling of it is the revelation of Christ (Luke xvii. 22-24, 30). It depends upon His scattering the seed (Matt. xiii. 37); it suffers, is rejected, and will come again (Matt. xvi. 24-28). The contrast to it is formed by the *world*, apostate as it is from God (John xvi. 33), and ruled over

by Satan (John xii. 31, xiv. 30, xvi. 11). The *outward development* of the new disposition of things is *from within*. It proceeds from a peculiar inner life of the spirit, which is produced in man by the Holy Ghost, as *faith* in Christ (John iii. 3 ff.); as the child-like mind, which is unassuming and susceptible to divine things (Matt. xviii. 3, 4; Luke xviii. 17), depending on repentance (Matt. iv. 17); as a poverty of spirit which is conscious of its own insufficiency (Matt. v. 3), with a most heartfelt and honest desire after righteousness; as self-denying love to Christ and the brethren (Matt. x. 37, xx. 20-28). But this spiritual life does not retain an exclusively internal character. It shows itself in outward action, by which all the relations of life, and all objects of the will and procedure, are more and more shaped and transformed into a new order of things, according to the rule of this spiritual life (Matt. xiii. 31 f., 33). This development of the kingdom of God *from within* is opposed to the view of an outward realization which is not based on any spiritual life. This merely material view is resisted by the Lord in the case of the Jews, especially in Luke xvii. 20, 21. The *ἐντός* may be taken here as equivalent to *within*, as in Ps. ciii. 1, in the LXX.; or also as *among* you, as Xenoph. *Anab.* vi. 1, 5, *inside the phalanx*. The second interpretation is to be preferred, because the Lord is speaking to Pharisees, to whom He could not very well say that the kingdom was *inwardly* in them. But even thus the word retains an intimation of the internal character and spirituality of the kingdom. Together with this stress laid on its invisible nature, the Lord also depicts (in ver. 24) this same kingdom as appearing visibly.

The kingdom of God is also the *communion of spirits founded by Christ*. The idea of the *βασιλεία* implies that the divine system of life tends to a community of spirits. By the kingly will of God they are united in a common life in inward affinity.

As the kingdom of God on earth, it is, in the first place, a *fellowship of men*. This is clearly conveyed in the generally figurative delineations of Jesus. Thus, in the parable of the field (Matt. xiii. 24 f., 37 f., cf. 47-50); of the sitting down together in common (Matt. viii. 11, 12, cf. xxvi. 29; Luke xxii. 29, 30); of the great marriage feast (Matt. xxii. 2-14; Luke xiv. 15-24); of the wise and foolish virgins (Matt. xxv. 1-13); of the labourers in the vineyard (Matt. xx. 1-16); and the like (Matt. xxi. 33, 44; Mark xii. 1-12; Luke xx. 9-19).

All of these figures express a fellowship united for the possession of a common good, or to exercise some common action.

It also embraces *humanity as a whole*, without limitation to any particular part thereof, in contrast to the choice of the Jewish people. The gospel will be preached to the whole world (Matt. xiii. 38, 'The field is the world;' xxiv. 14, xxvi. 13, xxviii. 19). They shall come both from the east and from the west (Matt. viii. 11, 12; Luke xiii. 28, 29). Jesus has other sheep (John x. 16); He invites them from the highways and hedges (Luke xiv. 21; Matt. xxii. 10). The result of the actions of the wicked husbandmen (Matt. xxi. 33, 34; cf. John iii. 16, 17, viii. 12, ix. 5, xi. 9, xvi. 8, xvii. 21). We must not overlook the fact, that the Lord everywhere clearly says that a great portion of the Jews would not obtain a share in the kingdom, because they had not accepted the call; and that He expressly declares that the Jewish nation should cease to be the subjects of the kingdom of God (Matt. xxi. 33 f.). Because this nation first withstood God's ambassadors, and then despised and rejected them, and subsequently slew the Son; and because the rejected stone must be the headstone of the corner; therefore another people is brought in (Luke xx. 17, 18; cf. Tit. ii. 14),—not a distinct historical nation, but an ideal people, the whole body of those who are regenerated in the faith in Christ. With this must be compared the words of the Lord as to the judgment on the people (Matt. xxiv. 28; Luke xvii. 37, xxi. 5, 6, 20, 24): the Jewish commonwealth is the carcase left to the eagles,—the *caput mortuum*, as if ripe for judgment.

Just as it embraces humanity without any distinction of nation, so it also comprises *heaven and earth*, and likewise the coming periods of the world, both before and after the judgment. The Old Testament idea (except in Daniel, especially ch. xii. 2, 13) limited the kingdom to the present life, just as many Christians look upon God's kingdom as being supernatural, and confined to the world to come. The teaching of the Lord is opposed to both these limitations. According to Matt. xii. 28, xi. 12, Luke xvii. 20, 21, the kingdom exists on earth, and all nations on the earth shall receive it (Matt. xiii. 31, 33, viii. 11, 12, xxiv. 14). But its prototype is the *kingdom of God in heaven* (Matt. vi. 10, v. 10, 12, vi. 33): there Christ is, and the communion with Him is everlasting, death not being a destroyer of

it (John xii. 26, xvii. 22-24). It likewise embraces *all the periods of man's history*, from Christ onwards, both before and after the judgment (Matt. xi. 11, 12, iv. 17; Luke xvii. 20; Matt. xxviii. 20); also all generations of men, early or late (Matt. xx. 1-16, xxv. 34 ff.). Hence it is often represented by Christ as future.

Precisely because it embraces all generations of men and all times, yet, on the other hand, although everlasting in its essence, it is placed in relation to its actual appearance, in the sense that it is subject to a general temporal development, which has its prescribed epochs and culminating point. This gradual development is produced by the actual entry of God's kingdom into time and among mankind: it is thus become man-like. The history of man is also the history of God's kingdom. Mankind is, indeed, neither the sole nor the primitive factor of God's kingdom. Christ constitutes this; but He Himself is the living principle of the successive developments of this kingdom, by communicating His life to this communion of spirits and order of things, or by revealing Himself (Luke xvii. 30). Consequently the stages of development of the kingdom of God are the stages and various modes of His *παρουσία*; and in the consummation of this is produced the culminating point of its development, the *κρίσις* is completed, the distinction between the heavenly and earthly kingdom of God is removed, and the *παλιγγενεσία*, the regeneration of the world (Matt. xix. 28), has appeared. There are, therefore, two chief periods of God's kingdom, which are separated by the epoch of judgment. The Lord describes them as *αἰῶνες*, and the present one as *ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος*, and the other as the *αἰὼν μέλλον* (Matt. xii. 32); or *ὁ καιρὸς οὗτος*, and *ὁ αἰὼν ὁ ἐρχόμενος* (Mark x. 30); or *ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος*, and *ὁ αἰὼν ἐκείνος* (Luke xx. 34, 35). The epoch which forms the point of division between the two periods may be perceived from Matt. xxiv. 3 ff., xxviii. 20, xiii. 40, 49. By it the characters of the two periods are described. First, the mixture of good and evil,—the existence together of the kingdom of God and the world. During this period, it is the task of God's kingdom to pervade the *κόσμος*, and to win over those who belong to it (Matt. xiii. 33). Then comes the existence by itself of God's kingdom in its purity and perfection (Matt. xiii. 40-43), when "the righteous shall shine forth like the sun in the kingdom of their Father" (ver. 43).

But this selfsame kingdom of God, which among men is thus

subject to a gradual development, extends *beyond the world of men*, to *the angels*, who are also comprehended in it. The teaching of the Lord presupposes the existence of angels, as spirits which are immortal, and without material bodies distinguished by sex (Matt. xxii. 30); they are raised above the earthly human condition by their intelligence (Matt. xxiv. 36; Mark xiii. 32), and by their holiness and blessedness (Matt. xviii. 10; Luke xv. 10). They had been already known under the old covenant; but their position is now more clearly defined by their relation to the Son of God. Jesus speaks of these spirits in various connections, when He treats of His own person, or of a blessed immortality. His mention of them is interwoven with the religious truths which He propounded. When He met the disciples whom He had first called (John i. 52), He declares to them that they will hereafter see the heaven open, and the angels of God ascending and descending on the Son of man. They would therefore hereafter become conscious that heaven was open as regarded Christ,—open in the midst of His earthly life for spiritual intercourse, and for the reception of heavenly power and heavenly ministry. The Son of man also appears as the object, to minister to whom the angel-world is sent. He is their Head,—at first, indeed, during the period of His lowliness, and limited by it,—but they are *His* angels (Matt. xvi. 27, xiii. 41, xxiv. 31; cf. Mark xiii. 32). These spirits are, however, placed by the Lord in a moral relation to man. They always behold the face of their Father in heaven (Matt. xviii. 10). They rejoice over a converted sinner (Luke xv. 10). This moral relation is doubtless to be understood in nearly the same way as in Heb. i. 14; it is an intercourse between angels and mankind for the furtherance of some moral aim in men. We must, for this very reason, assume that the Lord looked upon angels as members of God's kingdom. They are His instruments in it,—His instruments in the consummation of this kingdom by His appearance; His instruments in the great work of redeeming and blessing mankind; His instruments, too, in the life of the Lord Himself, at His birth, His resurrection and ascension, and also on the occasion of His temptation (Matt. iv. 11), and at Gethsemane (Luke xxii. 43),—in every case in harmony with the position which they fill in His teaching. But, as morally intelligent beings, they cannot be mere instruments, and must also have a personal aim; they must therefore be members

of God's kingdom, but with this distinction from us, that we are subjects of redemption, which, as regards the angels, we have no right to assume. The prayer taught by our Lord, that God's will may be done on earth as in heaven, must be referred to the agency of angels (Matt. vi. 10). Owing to the angels, therefore, the kingdom of God already exists in its truth and reality, entirely setting aside its continuance on earth. Hence the Lord never says that it takes its rise on earth, but that it *comes* to us (Matt. vi. 10), and is at hand (Matt. iv. 17).

§ 40. *The Development of the Kingdom of God upon Earth—The Church and its Inherent Means of Grace.*

We have to confine our remarks to the *kingdom of God on earth among men*, for only as to *this* does the Lord give us any further details. As to its *connection* with the *heavenly* kingdom, He affords us some few intimations; but with regard to this heavenly kingdom itself, as it at present exists, we have no teaching at all. It may be said that the Church is not in any respect identical with the kingdom of God; but yet the actual kingdom of God on earth coincides with the Church. Wherever Christ is at work, there is the kingdom of God. He, however, works only where His word works, and this takes place where the Church is; or inversely, wherever this takes place, in some way or other the Church will exist.

The Lord expressly speaks of His community upon earth by the term *ἐκκλησία* (Matt. xvi. 18, xviii. 17). In the former passage, indeed, He understands thereby His community on earth generally in its identity with the kingdom of God (cf. ver. 19, *βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν*), so far as it is on earth, but without any local or temporal restrictions, the Church of Christ in its universal character. But in the second passage He points to some local community, the community of believers in some particular place (according to the connection with vers. 15 and 16). We therefore have the word *ἐκκλησία* in its twofold meaning, as it is also found in Paul's writings. De Wette has indeed looked upon this designation of Christ's community as an anachronism which did not proceed from Jesus Himself. But there can be no doubt that He viewed the believers in Him as forming an *outward* community, both on account of the institution of Baptism, and likewise because the inward or spiritual

community which He desired to found for His disciples must necessarily lead to an outward fellowship. But the expression conveying this idea was readily furnished Him by the mother tongue. The question was here as to the three words קָהָל, עֵדָה, and מִקְרָא, the last of which, from its derivation, is closely allied to ἐκκλησία. The theocratical popular assembly, the congregation of the people, especially the assemblage of the people at the feasts, and next, in a narrower sphere, the local congregational gatherings, which for five centuries before Christ had come together in the synagogues, were all facts so closely bearing on the matter, that it cannot be conceived why the Lord should not have been led to express the idea of a Church. The three Hebrew terms designating the congregation of the people, which are rendered in the LXX. by the word ἐκκλησία, naturally form the groundwork of the conception (although συναγωγή certainly occurs in the New Testament). In the discourses in St. Matthew in which the idea occurs, there is, however, nothing which justifies our doubting their originality. The discourses in St. John do not contain the idea, although it is used in the 3d Epistle of St. John for the assembly of the community. Yet, on the other hand, the discourses in St. John contain, very decidedly, a general idea of the association of believers, which also is manifested outwardly (cf. ch. x. 16, ch. xiii.–xvii.).

The *most general characteristics* which constitute the identity of the Church with the βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ need no very diffuse discussion. The fellowship of believers with Christ has been before treated of. The spiritual and internal fellowship of believers naturally follows. The Lord unites faith in Him with love towards the brethren. He makes this love a *καινὴ ἐντολή* (John xiii. 34), as a commandment peculiar to Himself (ch. xv. 12),—"that ye love one another as I have loved you." It is the characteristic mark of His disciples, in contrast to the hatred of the world (ch. xv. 17), in reference to which this love was to be their comfort and compensation. Therefore the apostles and all believers were to be inwardly *one* (John xvii. 21), in virtue of their communion with Christ and the Father; and this very union was to be a cause that the world should believe that Christ was sent by the Father (John xvii. 21). This inward union necessarily leads to an outward fellowship,—all inner life striving for an outward manifestation,—as, in the community of

the apostles during Jesus' stay on earth, was represented by the figure of an outward fellowship of believers; and, as He Himself distinctly intimated, both by His directions and promises to His apostles (Matt. xvi. 19, xviii. 18, 19; John xx. 23; Matt. xxviii. 19, 20; Mark xvi. 15), and also by the institution of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, that an external fellowship among them was the object of His aim and His anticipation. With this we must class the decided summons to them to acknowledge their belief in Him before men (Matt. x. 32, 33; Luke xii. 8, 9; cf. Matt. xii. 30), as, of course, the whole existence of an outward community of faith, and, so far, of the kingdom of God, depended on this confession. By this, too, may be explained the great importance which Jesus attributes to this confession before men as a fundamentally essential requisition. Pertaining to this subject, also, is the presupposition of an external union for the purposes of prayer (Matt. xviii. 19, 20), and the direction (John xiii. 12 f.) to serve one another mutually, in humble, self-denying love, for which the washing of the apostles' feet is to be taken as a pattern. Added to this is the exhortation, that whosoever would be great in the kingdom of God should seek pre-eminence only in an active and self-sacrificing willingness of service (Matt. xx. 25-28); that His cause should bring about a dissolution of previous relations, even the most intimate (Matt. x. 34 ff., cf. ver. 17), and bitter persecution (Mark. xiii. 9-13; John xv. 18, xvi. 1-4); but that this, on the other hand, partly originates and partly presupposes fresh connections and a firm union therein. Lastly, the special instructions in the case of one believer being injured by another (Matt. xviii. 15), where the existence of an external community is expressly decided. Added to this, we have the parabolic delineations of the kingdom of God on earth, in which it appears as a fellowship of men. This community, therefore, as one developing itself from within, depends on the *communication of the life of Christ*, and is *founded, maintained, and guided by Him*. He thus speaks of the building of His Church (Matt. xvi. 18), which He desires to found on the rock Peter. He promises to His people His quickening and guiding presence until the end of the world (Matt. xxviii. 20). All authority, as well as all power, is to be attributed by His presence to even the smallest gathering of His people in His name (Matt. xviii. 20); and, indeed, in every individual believer He will

make His abode (John xiv. 23). To His people He will communicate the Holy Spirit of truth (John xvi. 7, cf. xv. 26), so that He will always abide in them (John xiv. 16, 17), and will fulfil all the prayers made by believers in His name (John xiv. 13, xv. 7, xvi. 23). As being founded and guided by Him, the Church has an immovable existence (Matt. xvi. 18), and the gates of death shall not prevail against it, cf. Job xxxviii. 17. Hades in this passage may be compared to the *Sheol* in Sol. Song. viii. 6, 7: it is the destroying idea, the powers opposed to divine life, which are supposed to be combined in a strong castle, as if in a king's palace (Luke xi. 21, 22), which stands in hostile opposition to God's temple. The building of the Church founded by Christ upon a rock is, on the contrary, of sure and firm continuance. In the idea of Christ's Church, these are the general characteristics which constitute its identity with the conception of God's kingdom.

Christ's word, Baptism, and the Lord's Supper appear as the special signs of the peculiarity of the Church, or, as the groundwork of God's kingdom upon earth.

The *word of Christ* is the authentic testimony of God's Son (John iii. 11); the word of God (John xii. 48-50, xiv. 10, vii. 16, xvii. 6); the truth which sanctifies and sets free from sin (John viii. 31 f., xvii. 17). It is the spirit and the life (John vi. 63), the life-giving seed from which sprung the new spiritual life of men, and from which subsequently the Church of Christ grows up, although this seed does not always fall in good ground (Matt. xiii. 3, 9; cf. the parallel passages). By this word is faith brought about (John xvii. 20, v. 24); and by this word will unbelievers be judged at the last day (John xii. 48). Whosoever hears the word and acts according to it, is brought thereby into a spiritual relation and spiritual communion with Christ, and is a partaker in His salvation (Luke viii. 21, xi. 28.) Whosoever abides in it and keeps its commandments, his prayers will be heard as being in fellowship with Christ, and he will receive the Spirit of truth (John xv. 7, 14, 15-17). Thus the word of Christ is essentially the first groundwork of His Church, or of the community of believers on earth. Men possess it only through Christ. But it is not the full and complete groundwork, for Baptism and the Lord's Supper follow, and are closely connected with it.

With regard to *Baptism*, only a few utterances are recorded: the command to baptize (Matt. xxviii. 19; Mark xvi. 16), and

the passage John iii. 5, which must be interpreted as an allusion to baptism; to this must be added the statement that the Lord caused His disciples to baptize (John iv. 1, 2). The command to baptize, which connects together the two ideas of *baptism*, and teaching or *making men into disciples*, for this very reason shows that, in addition to the word, baptism is also the way to Jesus. This idea is also clearly implied in Mark xvi. 16. Likewise also, in John iii. 5, the participation in the kingdom of God is conditional on a birth, not only of the Spirit, but also of water. From this passage it is clear that the Spirit, as the regenerating principle, receives an elementary groundwork by His union with the water, by which also the negative side of purification from the world, and the positive side of entry into a new life, are comprehended. With respect to the question as to infant baptism, this cannot be directly proved from the words of the Lord. His language about little children (Matt. xix. 13 ff., xviii. 3) proves, indeed, that individuals of this tender age were not to be excluded from Him, and that it was the susceptible and confiding mind of childhood which rendered men susceptible of the word of God and the influence of Christ. On the one hand, however, we know not whether the children were of altogether tender years; and although we may also say that no earlier point can indeed be fixed at which an absolute non-susceptibility could commence, yet, on the other hand, it is only Christ's blessing which is in question; and, if we consider the combination of the word and baptism which exists in the command to baptize (Matt. xxviii. 19), and the promise (Mark xvi. 16), we must see that baptism of infants exists, at all events, in some different sense than in the case of adults.

With regard to the Lord's Supper, the only passages we have to consider in the Synoptists are the narratives of its institution (Matt. xxvi.; Mark xiv.; Luke xxii.; cf. 1 Cor. xi.). In John, we have the momentous utterances of our Lord, as to eating the flesh and drinking the blood of Christ, contained in John vi.

The institution took place at the last passover feast, whilst Jesus was at the table with the disciples; but it was nevertheless a matter to be specially distinguished from the passover meal. This latter point is clear, even in Matthew and Mark, although we are only told that the distribution of the bread took place *while they were eating*. This cannot be taken as the

præteritum, in favour of which view an appeal has vainly been made to Matt. xiv. 21. But it can only mean while they were sitting at table, and must not be referred to the time whilst they were engaged in eating the passover meal. Even were this the case, Jesus' action would be distinguished from the passover meal itself; because Jesus, even according to Matthew and Mark, accompanied the distribution of the bread and wine with a special command, and also specially invited them thereto. The distinction appears even more decidedly in Luke and Paul, by whom the delivery of the cup is said to have taken place *after supper*. This addition is evidently intended to distinguish the cup from that which was drunk from at the solemnization of the passover meal, the latter only introducing the former.

The meaning of the action is, at all events, chiefly that of a *memorial rite*. Although this may be gathered from the significance which Jesus attaches to the matter, it is completely placed beyond doubt by the accounts in Luke and Paul, which tell us that Jesus, in delivering the bread and cup (Paul), said, "This do in remembrance of me,"—an addition which certainly did not proceed from the subsequent rite, but, just on account of its actual existence, might have been the more readily omitted in Matthew and Mark, as John, in his selection of narratives, passed over the account of the institution as a point which was well known through the solemnity itself. Besides, the reference in the Synoptists to *drinking it new with them* in His Father's kingdom, renders it generally probable that the Lord, as Paul says, intended a memorial rite, which was to be repeated until the time of His appearance. More closely considered, however, the Lord's Supper is an action of the liveliest remembrance of Christ, as *sacrificed* for us, as *the Redeemer who died to reconcile us with God*.

But the main question now is, *In what relation do the bread and wine stand to the body and blood of the Lord?* This essentially depends on the interpretation of the words *τοῦτό ἐστι κ.τ.λ.* The assertion should never have been made, that, according to these words, *only* the *symbolical*, or *only* the *material* view could be adopted. Both views are possible, whatever the words may have meant in the Aramaic. '*Ἔστιν* may mean 'signifies,' or 'is,' and even John vi. is not compulsory on the point. In John vi. the idea is expressed, which, in the Lord's Supper, is developed into a rite. But the verses 51–58 may bear a twofold mean-

ing: *either* a mere believing appropriation of the offered up humanity of Christ, or an enjoyment (resulting from faith) of the humanity of Christ offered up in His atoning death, but glorified in heaven; *or*, on the other hand, that this humanity was (according to the material view) presented in the Lord's Supper in the elements of bread and wine. But ver. 55 is not decisively in favour of this latter view; for the *ἀληθῶς* retains all its due force, even if nothing but a *spiritual* nourishment in the narrower sense is here intended. Therefore, even according to this passage, the symbolical view is still permissible. Taking as our basis, therefore, the words used in the institution, and the passage in St. John's Gospel, *both views are exegetically tenable*. In the *symbolical* view, according to which the material elements, the bread and wine, are the symbols of Christ's body given for us in His death, and of His blood shed for us, but are *only this*, the outward partaking of the two elements is only a symbolical action,—an act of spiritual enjoyment,—in which we eat and drink the outward elements in lively faith, and thus inwardly appropriate to ourselves Christ's body that was offered, and Christ's blood that was shed for us (at least the spiritual fruit thereof), and thereby receive a strengthening of our communion of life with the Redeemer who died, rose again, and was glorified for us. Thus the symbolical view extends far beyond a bare Zwinglianism, and looks upon the matter in a way which is not unworthy of the important moment. But yet this view certainly fails to grasp a special peculiarity of the Lord's Supper, and of that which it affords, and is very far from representing all that is contained in the act, according to the material interpretation. But this latter is likewise, at least, very feasible. This (*τοῦτο*) bread is my body; this cup (or what is contained in it) is my blood. The principal objection which has been brought forward to this, from an historico-grammatical standpoint, is, that at the time of the institution the disciples could not have taken the words in this sense, because the Lord Himself was still present with them. But this cannot be considered as decisive. Many utterances of our Lord were not rightly understood by the disciples until a subsequent period, when they had received the Spirit of truth, and were enabled to survey the whole course of His appearance in all its important connection (John ii. 22, xx. 9). And even if we are compelled to assume that the first Lord's Supper, at its

institution, was not quite identical in its character with all subsequent celebrations, this need not cause us any difficulty; for our present solemnization of it is, indeed, subject to another change, when the fellowship of the Lord with believers shall have assumed another form, and He will drink it new with them in the kingdom of His Father (Matt. xxvi. 29). Only, it must be confessed, that no stringent necessity is presented to us for considering the material interpretation as the only correct one, and excluding entirely the symbolic view. We have hitherto spoken only of the exegetical interpretation of the words used in the institution of the Lord's Supper, taken by themselves. It is quite a different matter with regard to the question whether, by a consideration of the personality and the work of Christ, we may not be led beyond this purely exegetical result. On this point Paul's language in 1 Cor. x., the words of Jesus in John vi. as to the eating and drinking of His flesh and blood, and the dependence of salvation and life on the participation in these, and especially His reference to His exaltation and heavenly glorification as an explanation of the "hard saying" (John vi. 60-63), and, on the other hand, the apostle's representation of Christ as the Paschal Lamb, and, consequently, the whole system of types with which the Lord's Supper is thus connected, are all matters of the highest degree of importance. John the evangelist evidently looks upon the crucified Christ as the Paschal Lamb (John xix. 36), quoting the Lord's words to Moses, "A bone of him shall not be broken" (cf. Ex. xii. 46), and applying them to Christ's sufferings on the cross. In 1 Cor. v. 7 Paul expressly says that we have a Paschal Lamb in Christ. If the Christ who died for us is to be considered as a type of the paschal lamb, we are thereby led to a real and material comprehension of the body and blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper. If we carry back our thoughts to the transaction itself, we find Jesus with His disciples just as they were engaged in the solemnization of the passover meal,—that significant feast which had preceded the deliverance of the people out of their Egyptian bondage, as a solemn appropriation of the atonement which preserved the people from the destroying angel, so that they participated in the divine deliverance from their position of bondage. From this feast, Jesus passes on to an action in which He describes his body as that given to death, and His blood as the blood of the new covenant. What can seem more feasible,

than that with the new covenant a new covenant-feast should be founded? And, as in the old covenant the lamb which had been slain in the sanctuary as an expiation was subsequently eaten, so now the body and blood of Christ, which in the new covenant had been offered up as an atonement, was similarly an object of participation in the solemn feast of this covenant. How much to the purpose it seems to understand this participation as a substantial one! Certainly not materially (cf. John vi.), but with a view to the fact that He who gave Himself up to death was on the point of meeting with a heavenly glorification, and in a position to offer to His people His glorified humanity. Thus, He who was offered as an atonement for us, is also He who is offered for the nourishment of our life. But if this is not to be taken in a merely spiritual light, but in the comprehensive sense in which the Scriptures generally, especially the New Testament, understand the idea of life, and in which sense it everywhere appears in the writings of St. John, the above-mentioned view of the Lord's Supper is brought very closely home to us. The question is, as Christ is our Redeemer, having offered up His body and blood in death for us, is He not also the focus of life, by which is communicated both spiritual life, and also the life which glorifies our corporeal element, and communicated, indeed, in that very form which He sanctified and bequeathed to us in the Lord's Supper? In this, everything essentially depends on the idea formed as to the person of Christ, and not merely on the exegetical result of the words used at the institution. For this very reason, at the age of the Reformation, the controversy was not merely an exegetical, but rather a dogmatical one, dealing with the idea and nature of the person of Christ. The words of the Lord, that He was "the green tree" of humanity, may also embrace the substantial view of the Lord's Supper. Christ is the green tree of life,—the tree which once grew in paradise,—the fruit of which would have preserved men from death, and led them to spiritual glorification, even of their corporeal element. This source of life has again sprung up among mankind in the person of the Redeemer. It is His flesh and blood, and in His flesh and blood it is communicated; but so communicated, that, as pointed out in John vi. 63, it is the spirit which maketh alive. For this very reason, His death must be understood in connection with His ascension, exaltation, and heavenly glorification. At all

events, the Lord's Supper is a highly important groundwork of the Christian Church, and is given to believers for the strengthening of their faith, and as a continuous quickening and confirmation of a spiritual communion of love.

These, then, are the means of grace which form the groundwork of the Church as the community of believers or of God's kingdom, but only in this *αἰών*, for which reason also they are subject to change. The Church will continue in a future *αἰών*, but not in the same shape. But, evidently, baptism and the Lord's Supper can only remain entirely the same so long as the material elements are entirely the same. Nevertheless, these means of grace are the inexhaustible and pregnant groundwork of Christ's Church on earth.

§ 41. *The Development of the Kingdom of God upon Earth—The Nature of the Church in this World.*

In the first place, we find even already existing in the Church of our Lord, faith, love, and a knowledge of the true God and Redeemer (John xvii. 3), a perseverance in keeping to the word and commandments of Christ (*ὑπομονή*, John xiv. 21–24, xv. 10), and, as a result of this, a production of much fruit from the seed of God's word (Matt. xiii. 33 ; John. xv. 5, cf. 16), a following of Christ (John xii. 26 ; Matt. x. 38), a fearless confession of the Lord (Matt. x. 32, cf. vers. 26–31), and a testimony of Him (John xv. 27 ; Acts i. 8), prayer in the name of Christ (John xiv. 13, xv. 7, 16, xvi. 23 ; cf. Luke xi. 9–11 ; Mark xi. 23, 24), union for prayer and action in His name (Matt. xviii. 20), the joy and peace of Christ (John xiv. 27, xv. 11, xvi. 22, 24, 33). Only in this *αἰών* all these attributes are incomplete, the need for repentance continually remaining (Matt. vi. 12), and for divine preservation from temptation, as well as for personal watchfulness (Luke xxi. 34–36 ; Matt. xxvi. 41). The purification (John xv. 2) and the sanctification of believers is also required (John xvii. 17); for, although they are born of the Spirit (John iii.), yet the influence of the *σὰρξ* and its weakness is not removed. In the apostolic sphere, Peter is a striking example of this weakness: like him, we also often need re-conversion (Luke xxii. 31–34, cf. 61, 62). This leads us to the second part of our subject.

This is the juxtaposition of the Church and the world, the *κόσμος* (John xvii. 11–16, xv. 18 ff. ; Matt. xviii. 7). Believers

are not *of* the world, but *in* it; and from the world offences come; the world, too, is the field on which the seed is sowed (Matt. xiii. 38). The word of Christ implants faith. The apprehending conviction of the Holy Ghost will lead the world to faith and righteousness, that it may escape the judgment prepared for the prince of this world (John xvi. 8-11). But believers ever need to be kept from the world, and to this end our Lord prays to the Father (John xvii. 15). Among the children of the kingdom, the bad seed is sown by the wicked one, as the enemy of God and His kingdom, so that the children of God and the children of the wicked one must live together both locally and temporally (Matt. xiii. 24, 30, 37-43). This parable has a twofold meaning: not only that the co-existence of Christians and non-Christians affords a constant occasion for moral conflict, but also, and chiefly, that the children of the wicked one grow up among Christians who confess the Lord; and not as the mere remains of the pre-Christian period, but, on the contrary, they spring up in the midst of the Church itself. On this close juxtaposition is based a twofold feature in the Church of *αἰὼν οὗτος*: (1) The mingling of genuine and non-genuine members; (2) distinctive grades in the members of the Church who are not to be considered as non-genuine.

The Church, therefore, embraces within itself certain non-genuine members. Not even all those who call upon the name of the Lord are members of His kingdom (Matt. vii. 21), but only those who do the will of His Father. In addition to this, the Church finds its temptations and enemies among its own body: for none of its members are innate in it; on the contrary, those who are born within its sphere must be brought into a state of genuine membership in the Christian life by means of regeneration by water and the Spirit. The Church, therefore, is continuously affected by this mixture in its members; and even in the narrow circle of the twelve apostles, chosen by the Lord Himself,—the prototype of the Church,—in this *αἰὼν* all were attacked, and none remained untouched by temptation (Luke xxii. 31, 32), and one was a devil (John vi. 70, cf. xvii. 12). Notwithstanding the scandal in the Church arising therefrom, the Lord teaches in the parables in Matt. xiii., of the tares in the field and the fisherman's net, that this mixture of good and evil was both presupposed and tolerated by Him. Indeed, He speaks of His desire that His

people should not form an opinion in the matter, for men are not possessed of any infallible power of judgment; and besides this, those who now belong to the world may, sooner or later, by the efficacy of the word and means of grace, be brought into the community of Christ. This mixture of good and evil was not, therefore, to be outwardly dealt with; but the Church was to increase more and more through the power of the Spirit inwardly working in it, and in like measure those who belonged to the world were to be won from it. But a division is surely impending. It will not, however, be the work of man, but of the divine judgment. A comparative capability of recognising the genuine members of the Church is not thus denied; and, that the genuineness of God's kingdom as a whole cannot cease, is guaranteed to us by the word and other means of grace, and the promise of the Lord that He Himself will be ever present with His Church.

The distinction of degrees among the genuine members of the Church appears chiefly in some being eminent for activity and taking the lead, and in others being recipients of their ministry and guidance. Thus, in the very earliest times, in the sphere of the disciples themselves, we find our Lord recognising Peter as being fit to guide the others (John i. 42; Matt. xvi. 18, 19; Luke xxii. 32; John xxi. 15). The apostles themselves, on the other hand, as a body, stand in the position of guides and teachers to other believers (Acts i. 8; John xv. 27, xvii. 20; Matt. xxviii. 19; Mark xvi. 15; John xx. 21-23). They were, too, to be His witnesses to the people. But from Matt. x. 40-42 we see that still other distinctions arose: He distinguishes here between *apostles*, *prophets*, *righteous men*, and *disciples*. The latter is, perhaps, the most general designation, and marks the lowest stage among believers. The *disciples* are all who received instruction in common from Him, and came to Him with a readiness to learn of Him (cf. Matt. xi. 29, 30). These disciples become *righteous men*, who have actually attained to the *δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ*. The righteous man may become a *prophet*, provided with the gift of the Holy Spirit, viz. the specific *προφητεία*; and with this might the *ἀποστολή* be finally united. The apostle combined in his own person the attributes of disciple, righteous man, prophet, and apostle. We have also the distinction between the adults in grace and the little ones, that is, the weak and young (Matt. xviii. 5, 6), and the erring, who need to be directed right, and to

be helped according to the principle of love which seeks for and saves them (Matt. xviii. 11-14); which, indeed, does not foster the sin, but promotes its confession, with a view of saving and not of destroying. If one brother has injured another, the latter should in confidence represent it to him (Matt. xviii. 15, 16; Luke xvii. 3, 4), and should forgive him as often as he repents (Matt. xviii. 21, 22); but, of course, only on condition of his repentance, as without this he could not be said to have won over his brother. But if the offender will not listen to the private representation, one or two other brethren are to be called as witnesses (cf. Deut. xix. 15); and if this was of no avail, the matter was to be brought before the local community (Matt. xviii. 17). Throughout all these stages the offender is to be dealt with entirely according to the principles of redeeming love. But this love has its limit: it is not the part of the Church to foster the sin. If, therefore, the offender declines to listen to the Church, he must cease to belong to it; and, as far as he is concerned, the bond of brotherhood is loosed (Matt. xviii. 17).

The general charge of guiding the community and preaching the word leads to other duties and charges,—that of praying in the name of the Church, and of announcing to individuals the forgiveness of sins. The former charge was committed to them (Matt. xviii. 19), and the words of the apostles in Acts vi. 4 are fully in harmony with it. For the second charge, the authority is given them in John xx. 23, and Matt. xvi. 19, xviii. 18. But everything which the apostles and other individuals do of an authoritative character is to be done, not in a spirit of temporal dominion, but in the spirit of Christ's rule, and of a self-sacrificing, beneficent, and, in all its superiority, ministering love. Hence our Lord's earnest injunction against desiring to be among the chiefs in God's kingdom (Luke xxii. 24 ff.; Matt. xxiii. 8-11, xviii. 1-4).

§ 42. *The Development of the Kingdom of God upon Earth — The Course of Development of the Church on Earth.*

Just as, under the Old Testament dispensation, a divine prophecy was given in respect to the gradual development and final shape of the divine kingdom, so Jesus also predicted the future course of God's kingdom,—sometimes, indeed, only in single features, in depicting which He pointed to the future universal spread of the

gospel and its acceptance by all nations (Matt. viii. 11, 12, xxvi. 13; John xvii. 23, x. 16, xii. 31 f.), sometimes in more connected language, both in didactic statements and in parables. Among the discourses on the point, we have particularly Luke xvii. 20 ff., and then, just before His death, the comprehensive discourse in Matt. xxiv. f., Mark xiii., Luke xxi. 5 ff. It is possible that Matthew, here as elsewhere, combined in one suitable connection various utterances of Jesus which were spoken at different times. The parables bearing on the point were also delivered in the last period of Jesus' life, as that of the tenants of the vineyard (Matt. xxi. 33), of the marriage feast (Matt. xxii. 2-14), of the talents (Matt. xxv. 14-30; cf. Luke xix. 12-27), of the bridegroom coming (Matt. xxv. 1-12).

The *chief epochs* brought forward are the first and last periods, which are inwardly allied with one another, and the interval lying between these two points.

The *first epoch* is the destruction of the Jewish state and church. Thus was the national basis overthrown on which the Old Testament dispensation was founded, and on account of which the kingdom of God could make its appearance in this nation only (John iv. 22; Matt. x. 5 f.; Luke ix. 1 ff., x. 1 ff.). The Lord Himself limits His personal ministry to Israel (Matt. xv. 24); and in Israel does the Church first grow up, although it is destined to embrace all nations. If Israel as a body had fallen in with the counsel of God, the Church would have extended itself from them as a centre, and have spread simply and constantly among all nations. The grain of mustard-seed would gradually have grown up into a tree, in the branches of which all nations would have lodged. But the opposition of the Jews necessitated another course of development,—a mighty severance of a portion of this nation, a judgment upon it, and a breach between God's kingdom and the nation as a nation. The Lord declared this most distinctly, as in the forcible parable (Matt. xxi. 33, 34) of the tenants of the vineyard, and in that of the marriage feast (ch. xxii. 1-14; cf. Luke xiv. 16-27). The Lord speaks still more plainly in the prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem (Matt. xxiv. f.), in the week of passion, on the Mount of Olives. In all three gospels the account begins in a similar way, with the declaration of the approaching complete destruction of the temple. Then follows the question, when these things shall be? Jesus'

answer relates chiefly to the destruction of Jerusalem (Matt. xxiv. 5-28; Mark xiii. 5-23; Luke xxi. 8-24). In St. John we do not find this prediction, although perhaps the words in ch. ii. 19 may be considered as an intimation of it; perhaps, too, and even more decidedly, the statement as to the cessation of divine service on Mount Sion (ch. iv. 21). All that He predicted took place, and no one could have foreseen it from a merely human standpoint. This event has truly become an epoch in the development of the Church. From that time forwards the divine judgment on the Old Testament economy was manifestly placed beyond doubt, and the independence of the Christian Church was likewise rendered certain. This destruction of the external nation was not to be identical with the founding of the Church. The Christian community must first exist, in order that it may draw to itself all the sound elements in the organism of the Old Testament theocracy. As the latter is now a carcase, therefore the eagles are gathered together (Matt. xxiv. 28). Moreover, its destruction frees the Church from all kind of persecution and restriction on the part of the Jews; and, helping to free it from Judaistic elements, proves it to be an emanation of divine power for all times and peoples. This epoch bears, therefore, a twofold character, as a judgment and a deliverance. And this is what it has in common with the last epoch. The colouring of the representation is therefore somewhat similar in both. On the old theocracy a κρίσις had come; and, as regarded the Christian Church, a similar judgment was impending in the συντέλεια κ.τ.λ.

But in the interval between these two epochs lies the *period of the spread of Christianity among all nations*. With this is connected His exhortation to a proper use of the talents entrusted to us, and to a patient waiting for Him (Luke xvii. 22). Not only had He enjoined on His apostles this propagation of the gospel (Matt. xxviii. 20), and sufficiently proved the universal nature of God's kingdom, but He also brings it forward as a prediction in connection with His prophecy as to the last days (Matt. xxiv. 14; Mark xiii. 10). There are utterances on this point also in St. John: not only the words to the Samaritan woman (ch. iv. 23), but also in the passage as to other sheep which Jesus has, and the one flock under one Shepherd (ch. x. 16). In His parables the Lord alludes in various ways to the calling of the heathen, as in that in which the people are said to be invited from the highways

and hedges to come to the feast (Matt. xxii. 9 ff.; Luke xiv. 23), after those that were bidden had refused to come; and also in the parable of the labourers in the vineyard, and their increase from hour to hour (Matt. xx. 1). He is the Bridegroom for whom His people are to wait and watch, ready both for the joyful feast and for His service. But the progress of God's kingdom on earth is, in the first place, left to the exertion of man; for the Lord Himself charged the apostles with the first propagation of His kingdom. And in the parable (Mark iv. 26–29) He interferes only at the beginning and end, in the sowing and reaping, the intervening development itself (ver. 28) taking place without Him: the growing corn, the Church, is left to itself (*αὐτομάτη*). This course of development goes, therefore, through manifold phases, conditional on the zeal or indolence of Christ's disciples in every age,—depending, indeed, on the whole history of mankind. This period, therefore, may be far more protracted than seemed likely at the beginning, when the consummation of the first epoch was alone looked to. The Lord has, however, fixed no time for it. The last epoch must, nevertheless, surely come to pass before.

This last epoch is the *συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος*, the *entire cessation of the present temporal period*. In the parables (Matt. xiii.), it is pointed out as the final severance of the world from God's kingdom. In it, also, there again appears a peculiar agency of the Lord (Mark iv. 29). This epoch is also spoken of as the day of judgment (Matt. vii. 22, xxiv. 37 ff.); as the last day (John vi. 39, 44, 54); and as the decisive hour (John v. 28). At all events, the Lord also speaks of this end of the world in His great discourse (Matt. xxiv. f.), though whether the *τέλος* (ver. 6) applies to it is doubtful; but, at any rate, the section (vers. 29–31) refers to this event (cf. Mark xiii. 24–27; Luke xxi. 25–27). In this, the answer is given to the second part of the question on which the discourse is based. In earlier times, indeed, endeavours have been made to apply even this section to the destruction of Jerusalem. But this view is opposed by the fact that, with the *εὐθέως* in ver. 29, something new evidently begins; and also, that this view cannot explain the words referring to the changes in the heavenly bodies, except in a very forced way. The view, however, that this section is intended to refer to the *συντέλεια τ. αἰῶν.*, but that Jesus deceived Himself not only in drawing a parallel between the events of the first and last epoch, but also in

uniting them with one another as almost contemporary, is contradicted by the fact that He presupposes the spread of the gospel over the whole earth as taking place before this final end; and also, that He represented this diffusion as taking place within one generation of men, which would be quite contrary to His general sober view of history. Indeed, His expressions immediately afterwards, as to the impossibility of any time being fixed for this *συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος*, cannot easily be reconciled with the above-named view. The Lord expressly says, in Matt. xxv. 1–13, that He would come later than was expected; and that, therefore, the servant would say, “My Lord delayeth His coming” (*χρονίζει*, Matt. xxiv. 48; Luke xii. 45); that He would come *μετὰ πολὺν χρόνον* (Matt. xxv. 19). He here distinctly expresses the lateness of the end to be expected; and in several parables He also represents the calling of men into His kingdom, and also its spread and accomplishment, as something which would take place very gradually, and as a long course of development. It is therefore impossible that He could have desired to state that the end of the world would follow immediately after the destruction of Jerusalem. With regard to this, therefore, a choice of two things appears to be presented to us. Either it is assumed that the word *εὐθέως* is not correctly reported,—but this is always the last resource of the exegetist,—or, the section beginning ver. 29 is not directly referred to the last epoch. After the Lord, in a gradual development of the course of events, and after warning His disciples against delusions, had shown forth the fall of the Jewish nation, then is said to follow the overthrow of heathenism and the gradual spread of God’s kingdom (ver. 31), with the promise (ver. 34) that, until that time arrived, *the nation* should not cease to exist (Dorner). There is, of course, no doubt that *γενεὰ* may be referred to *the nation*, and by no means (Strauss) must signify the then existing generation. But, on the other hand, this last meaning of *γενεὰ* is possible, and even probable; but only the beginning of all these things (the predicted events, as the signs in the fig-tree, which show the approach of summer, but not its complete arrival) must be placed in the time of this generation. On the other hand, the interpretation of ver. 29 as depicting the overthrow of heathenism, especially of the worship of the stars, is altogether too artificial. Others get over the difficulty by recognising in vers. 29–31 the judgment on the *then*

existing world, the Roman empire (*σημεῖον*, in ver. 30, is the cross of Constantine), vers. 30 and 31 representing the first mighty spread of the gospel, and the gathering together of the Church on earth, in which the Lord Himself would appear to come. If we amplify this into a figure of the mighty changes which were brought about by Christianity in all relations, we should have an explanation at all events possible. But even then, both ver. 29, and also vers. 30 and 31, which appear most fittingly as a description of the final judgment, do not retain their full force.

Supposing now that the *εὐθέως* in ver. 29 is taken in its proper meaning, and not as an equivalent to *suddenly* (which is evidently impossible), and that vers. 29–31 are interpreted in the most natural way as referring to the latest future, still an explanation may be found of this conjunction of events by assigning it to the *nature of prophecy*, which, in a far-reaching, prospective delineation, can depict distant objects as close at hand, and, in spite of a preparatory interval, can comprehend in one glance, even as regards time, events which are *ideally allied*. The difficulty is not to be denied; but it need not be considered strange, if considered as belonging to the *province of prophecy*. At all events, the fact remains that the Lord most decidedly states that the time of this *συντέλεια* cannot be fixed; and this the apostles also have maintained.

The whole course of this development, as regards its chief epochs, is conditional on the *advent of the Lord*, and the *judgment coming on the earth*. The *παρουσία* of Christ is spoken of in Matt. xxiv. (vers. 27 and 39) and Luke xvii. (vers. 24, 30). It will be as a lightning flash, which lights up the whole horizon. This coming of the Lord affects, however, the first as well as the last epoch of God's kingdom.

In St. John, the Lord speaks much of a certain inward coming (ch. xiv. 18, 23, xvi. 17, 19); of His coming through the communication of the Spirit, which is, at the same time, a coming of the Father to believers. In ch. xvi. 22 is included also the appearance of the Risen One. The passage, ch. xxi. 22, 23, appears to refer to a more outward appearance. John also, in his first Epistle, speaks of an outward coming. In the Synoptists we find very various utterances of Jesus as to His coming. Sometimes He represents it as very near (Matt. x. 23, xvi. 28 ;

Luke ix. 27; Matt. xxvi. 24), ἀπάρτι, hereafter they shall see Him, consequently, He will come; or, ere the present generation shall have passed away. We also find them without any time being fixed (Matt. xxiv. 38, 39; Luke xix. 12–15). Or it is an unexpected coming (Matt. xxiv. 43–46); later, perhaps, than was expected (Matt. xxv. 1–13, cf. xxiv. 48; Luke xii. 45). Also, His coming is delayed; and in Matt. xxv. 19 it is expressly defined as a coming after a long time. The time is described as indeterminate (Matt. xxiv. 36; Mark xiii. 32; Acts i. 7). We thus have this coming described sometimes as close at hand, sometimes distant, sometimes as determinate, and sometimes as indeterminate. From all this we may gather that it is not one single fact which is in question, but something comprehensive and continuous. Thus, in the Synoptists, who appear to speak more of fixed times, we find the statement that He will always be with His people. In John, on the other hand, in whom the idea of a spiritual coming prevails, His appearance in the resurrection is also brought forward. His constant presence must therefore be distinguished from the special moments of His extraordinary manifestations, in which, indeed, the former is outwardly produced. They form a παρουσία of Christ; and on them the development of the Church, or kingdom of God, is dependent.

With the παρουσία a continuous judgment is united. The Lord speaks of the judgment as one that is present (John v. 24, iii. 18, 19, xii. 31, xvi. 11); as one that is future (John v. 29); likewise in the Synoptists (Matt. xvi. 27, x. 32, and the parallel passages). The nature of the judgment is a severance of those who have assimilated themselves to the gospel from those who have opposed it. Hence the first epoch of the destruction of Jerusalem is a judgment, and, as a judgment, precedes the whole of the further course of development. The gospel is always the touchstone, by the decision of which men are divided. But still there remains a residue of the non-susceptible. The final judgment, therefore, follows at the end of time in the συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος.

§ 43. *The Kingdom of God in the World to come.*

The judgment in the Church of Christ is distinguished from the universal judgment, and is thus represented in the parables of the ten virgins and of the talents. This former judgment

has to deal with faithful conduct in Christ's kingdom. By this completion of judgment the *παλιγγενεσία* is also brought about, which coincides with the commencement of the *αἰὼν μέλλον*. This relates to the whole world (Matt. xix. 28), and is therefore a regeneration of the world in general, and consequently a renovation of nature in the sense of Rom. viii. For the faithful, in particular, it is also the *ἀνάστασις ζωῆς* (Luke xiv. 14), the shining forth of the righteous (Matt. xiii. 43); and this is a glorification of the body and not of the spirit only (Matt. xxii. 23-33). The Lord shows that this is based on the quickening power of the divine omnipotence; and that it is a glorification in which all sexual union ceases, is distinctly expressed. The existence of the righteous will be like that of the angels: they are *υἱοὶ Θεοῦ*; and there is *ζωὴ αἰώνιος* in the full sense of the word.

It has been maintained, that in St. John's Gospel Jesus teaches only of a continuous and not of a final conclusive judgment. But in John v. 29 the latter is clearly spoken of (cf. 1 John iv. 17). The general characteristic of the judgment as a separation of good and bad is common to all the discourses of Jesus. Beyond the last judgment, we have no trace afforded us in Jesus' words whereby we might pursue the subject further than is expressed above.

SECOND PART.

THE APOSTOLIC AGE.

§ 44. *Introduction.—Our Sources of Information.*



THE more we endeavour to obtain an insight into apostolical Christianity as an organic and living whole, both in its original shape and its historical development, the more important shall we find those monuments of the apostolic spirit which owed their origin to the apostles themselves (Paul, John, Peter, and James). But, even apart from their origin, the contents of the apostolical writings prove them to be the richest and the most profound in the New Testament canon. Certain writings, which do not proceed from apostles, are also to be considered as chief sources of information; for in them, too, we are able to gather an historical acquaintance with apostolical Christianity. Among these we reckon the *Antilegomena* both of the ancient Church and also of our modern criticism. As, for example, the Epistle to the Hebrews, which, if not written by Paul himself, was certainly composed in the apostolical Church, and in the spirit thereof: this gives a peculiar view of the development of the Church, forming in its teaching an evident transition between that of Paul and John. The Epistle of St. James is also a very characteristic monument of this age, and its historical value is acknowledged, in spite of any doubt as to the person of its author. The Book of Revelation, also, although it may not be acknowledged as the work of the Apostle John, must at all events be considered as a very ancient writing of the apostolical Church, and specially noteworthy in an historical point of view. The Epistle of St. Jude, and the second and third Epistles of St. John, are not so important; but nevertheless they also serve to complete the whole representation of the apostolic age. Even the second Epistle of St. Peter, which is so unfavourably looked

upon by modern criticism, is shown by its doctrinal purport to be of an essentially apostolic character. If we thus admit into our consideration the Antilegomena of the ancient Church, still less are we entitled to exclude the books objected to in modern criticism. We shall, therefore, take as our immediate sources of information the whole of the books of the New Testament, although we may recognise some gradation in their historical importance.

In the Acts of the Apostles we have an historical work belonging to the New Testament, which takes as its aim a history, although not a complete one, of this age. For this reason, it must form a very rich and direct source of information for us. The book begins with the ascension of Jesus, and concludes with the second year of St. Paul's imprisonment at Rome. It has been customary to divide it into two parts, the first of which (ch. i.-xii.) related the spread of Christianity among the Jews, the second (ch. xiii.-*fin.*) described the same event as respects the Gentiles,—Peter being the chief personage in the first part, and Paul in the second. But a threefold division seems rather to commend itself, which follows the stages of development of the Christian community: (1) ch. i.-vii; (2) ch. viii.-12; (3) ch. xiii.-*fin.* In any case, the last section appears as the culminating point of the whole history, and therefore that from which the aim of the book is to be gathered. The whole narrative has in view to supply a divine vindication for the ministry of the apostle to the Gentiles; and this Pauline spirit is so decided, that the agreement between it and the Pauline epistles affords the best refutation of the objection that the Acts of the Apostles has not given the correct historical delineation of St. Paul. Very ancient testimony ascribes to St. Luke this book as well as the gospel. This thoroughly agrees with the tendency of the work, Luke having been, according to Col. iv. 14, Philem. 24, a companion of the Apostle Paul, and is, besides, described as a Gentile Christian. There can be no doubt that the Acts of the Apostles forms a direct source of information as to the historical life of that time, and is also a valuable monument of the ruling tendency of the spirit peculiar to this time; this fact, however, does not do away with the fidelity of the narrative as to individual persons, their lives and sayings, as may be shown by a comparison with their own writings.

All other sources beyond those contained in the New Testament can only claim a very indirect value: the greater part are of service merely in allowing inferences to be drawn from them, or in confirming the direct data which we have at our command, throwing light upon the latter, and pointing out their connection. The heathen and Jewish accounts are the furthest removed from our purpose. The apocryphal epistles and Acts of the Apostles render us little more than a negative service, their imitative character making the true picture of those times stand out in a brighter light. The writings of the apostolical fathers, some of whom were contemporary with the apostles, are of somewhat more importance, although these works were not composed until after the apostles' departure. The first Epistle of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians takes the lead among these, perhaps also that of Polycarp to the Philippians. But even these, at the most, only approach the historical shape of the apostolical times, and can serve merely for elucidation and corroboration.

FIRST DIVISION.

THE LIFE OF THE APOSTLES.

§ 45. *A Consideration of the Subject.*

THE apostolical life well deserves to be separately treated of in Biblical Theology, and cannot properly be dealt with as a mere introduction to the apostolical system of doctrine,—by a few brief historical notices as to their persons and circumstances. For the apostolical life is the fulfilled fact of the promise of a higher communication of the Spirit, and of the new life both in thought and action which was thereby produced, on which the characteristic development of Christianity in this period was based. But, even in this part, a limit is set to this historical statement, by the fact that all we have to deal with are certain characteristic historical features and the interpretation of them, and, consequently, not a real history, but merely a selection of facts, the survey of which may enable a satisfactory idea to be formed. Added to this, we must not forget that the significance of the facts is not so great here as in the first part, in which the question was as to the events on which Christianity is altogether based. In this second period, therefore, we shall be able to treat this historical part with more brevity.

The apostolic life was devoted to a gradual course of education, in which the apostles took the lead of the rest. Its development consisted chiefly in a process of separation from the limits of the Jewish nationality, and the conflicts connected therewith. These form the centre-point of their history, because in them the historical character and vocation of Christianity opens for itself a path. Thus, the actions of the Apostle Paul bearing on these points, and the preparatory events that preceded them, must constitute the centre of our statement. Previously, however, we must notice the first beginnings of the apostolic life generally, and, as these exhibit their origin in the free, world-renewing agency of the divine Spirit, we shall naturally proceed to con-

sider those features in which the nature of this agency is displayed. Finally, we must cast a glance at the external action of the apostolical community, both in its outwardly directed struggles, and also in its peculiar stamp in prescribed forms,—which two points, inasmuch as they generally presuppose the internal historical development, will most suitably form a conclusion. We shall thus keep to the three sections: the apostolic life; the development of the apostolic community; and its external action. In the first, we have to represent the commencement and the nature of the life; in the second, the stages of development before Paul, and the work of this apostle; lastly, in the third, the contest between the Church and the world, and the peculiar forms of association of the former.

I. THE APOSTOLIC LIFE.

§ 46. *The Commencement of the New Life.*

The commencement of this life was, indeed, previously prepared for. But, according to our New Testament records, the feast of Pentecost was decidedly the opening point of the independent standing forth of a special Christian life, let the outward events be considered how they may. From the statements of our evangelists, it is evident that this life was connected in a certain sense with the exaltation of Jesus, and that, in particular, the resurrection became the cause of the peculiar confirmation and elucidation of the faith. This may be gathered from the narratives in the gospels of Jesus' appearances after the resurrection, and of His words on these occasions, and the effects of both. Faith in the resurrection itself and its necessity, and likewise in the necessity of His sufferings and death (cf. the teaching of Jesus, Luke xxiv.), was already to some extent a clearing up of their idea as to the Messiahship. Their faith and their whole life would thus necessarily acquire a degree of independence, by means of which they would less and less need a visible intercourse with Jesus. His appearances, therefore, occurred only at intervals from time to time, until they ceased in a way which implanted in the disciples the full consciousness that their Lord now belonged to the invisible order of things, and that, notwithstanding His

heavenly glorification, He was not removed away from them, but that, on the contrary, He was now for the first time *truly* present with them, *i.e.* unrestrictedly in a divine way. Thus did their faith obtain that joyful strength and confidence, in which they became self-dependent (Luke xxiv. 52, 53; Mark xvi. 20; Acts i. 11–14). The characteristic of this life is the consciousness of the fellowship with the Exalted One vouchsafed to every individual. They then, still as a matter of an internal character, proceeded to fill up the number of the twelve apostles (Acts i. 15 ff.). But yet this life remained shut up, as it were, in the midst of the believers, without developing into any outward action. They only closely gathered together among themselves in faith and prayer, and in their mutual waiting in the *ὑπερῶν* devoted to meditation and devotion (ver. 13). They certainly had received the promise of a communication of the Spirit which was to take place in Jerusalem (Luke xxiv. 49; Acts i. 4, 5); their position, therefore, was one of expectation. But this waiting was, as we perceive, a preparative development. For this very reason, the commission given the disciples, united with the symbolical act of breathing on them (John xx. 21 f.), and the communication of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost, fit most suitably into one another. A communication, indeed, took place on the former occasion, but it had not yet reached the culminating point which was the requisite for their standing out publicly as apostles, and for an independent, church-founding efficacy. The feast of Pentecost on this account constituted an epoch; but this had also been prepared for. All these things form a gradual course of progress, which depended on the firm conviction of His resurrection and His ascension, and, by purification of their faith in Him, and the certainty of standing in dynamic fellowship with Him who now belonged to a supernatural life, led them on to the acceptance of their charge as public and active witnesses.

The *time of the commencement of the new life* is, therefore, the feast of Pentecost. According to the statement of the Acts of the Apostles, the apostles, without any preceding personal preparation or calculation, found themselves on that significant day suddenly urged on to a public testimony that Jesus was the Messiah. The moving cause was an external and extraordinary event, which was in full harmony with the significance both of the day and also of the first public testimony of Jesus. It was

the very day of the feast itself. For this interpretation of the words ἐν τῷ συμπληροῦσθαι is grammatically correct (although the other explanation of the approach of the feast is also philologically possible), and, internally, from the circumstances and the view evidently taken by the narrator, is the only one admissible.

This great event now ensued, in the first place, externally. After Jesus had assembled His disciples privately in Galilee, He had commanded them to wait in Jerusalem; they might therefore on this day have expected some special occurrence. At all events, they were assembled, according to custom, not in the temple, but in a private building, into which, however, others entered who did not belong to the body of disciples (Acts ii. 5 ff., 13). Then suddenly ensued the external extraordinary phenomena. There came from heaven a noise as of a mighty rushing wind, and it filled the whole house where they were assembled. This was addressed to the hearing. But there were also *visible* flames of fire in the shape of tongues, which sat upon each of them, and they began to speak in other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance. But other men also witnessed these phenomena.¹ These were pious Jews from the διασπορά, who dwelt scattered abroad among various Gentile nations, but, if possible, were partakers in the feast at Jerusalem, and especially desired to resort thither in their old age to spend there the evening of their lives, and there also to find a grave. The κατοικοῦντες (Acts ii. 5) cannot be understood to mean fixed inhabitants, but they might be visitors to the feast. As regarded the acceptance of Christianity, the Hellenistic Jews always showed themselves more susceptible than those of Palestine; thus even now, the former appear to have taken a peculiar interest in the infant Church. The noise of the rushing wind might have been audible outside the house to many in the now crowded city. At all events, a special occurrence was soon observable. The multitude crowded to the house, and found the apostles in a new and peculiar position, full of the Spirit, and speaking in inspired language,—each, indeed, hearing them speak in his own tongue (διαλέκτῳ). This is not a peculiarity of accent, or a subjective

¹ Does not the narrative lead us to infer that only believers were present in the house at the time the phenomena took place? The noise of the wind appears to have attracted many others, and amongst them some of the devout Jews mentioned in ver. 5.—TR.

mode of expression or style, or anything of the like, but a dialect or language. This is proved by the astonishment (vers. 9–11) of these foreigners from Asia (especially Asia Minor, also Arabia) and Africa (Egypt, and the region round Cyrene), and also from Rome, Crete, etc. There were certainly others there who did not understand any of the languages, and could not therefore share in the effects of the inspiration, grasping nothing but the outward signs; these made it a subject of mockery.

The *internal* fact connected with this event is the *implation* with the Holy Ghost, as a gift communicated to all present without distinction (not merely to the apostles), by which is intimated its destination for all men, without distinction of nation, sex, position, or age. This universality can at first be really and practically shown only in the community of believers then present; but the idea conveys its ultimate application to all men. The wind and the tongues of fire are the natural symbols of the communication of the Spirit (cf. John iii. 8; Matt. iii. 11). The fire gives the idea of purity, and the agitated air that of the life-giving principle. But the Spirit is also symbolized in the subject by the inspired speaking in unknown tongues, as He who breaks down the partitions which divide humanity. If we add the organic connection of the fact with the time and place,—its taking place in the metropolis of God's Messianic kingdom, and on the anniversary of the divine constitution of the theocratic nation,—all these things represent to us the full significance of the event which then actually constituted the new and Messianic community. For this reason has the apostolic Church so well preserved the memory of this day. An extraordinary fact was necessary to call forth the power of its action; a retrospective view of this action brought to mind the sure basis which was laid down by the overpowering fact. Deeply and clearly was it impressed upon the apostles, that from henceforth they felt within them a new life, which manifested itself in a special power, both of lucidity of perception and of zeal in action, just as the Apostle Paul describes the commencement of his apostleship (Gal. i. 15 ff.), when a new light broke in upon his night and darkness, so that he could not do otherwise than testify for Christ.

The importance of the fact is in full harmony with the immediate *result*, as shown in the first public discourse of Peter (Acts ii. 14–36). He testifies to the inward divine impulse

which actuated them, and attributes this communication of the Spirit to Jesus as its true cause. He represents it as a proof of the exaltation of the crucified One, who thus bore witness that He was the Messiah, and that He was to be recognised as such by the whole house of Israel. The result of the discourse was the conversion and baptism of a large number of the hearers,—so great was the impression made by the first apostolical preaching.

Difficulties have been met with in the *comprehension* of this event, arising partly from its inherent *character*, and partly from a *comparison* with a similar phenomenon of speaking with tongues in the apostolical community (1 Cor. xii. and xiv.).

The *credibility* of the narrative itself has been contradicted, partly on account of its *form* and *historical connection*, and partly on account of the *miraculous nature of the event*.

It was thought that traces might be discerned in the form of the narrative that it did not proceed from an eye-witness. Of course the locality is not described exactly (ver. 2), and likewise the approach of the foreigners,—in the first place, of the pious Hellenists (ver. 5). The *ἑτέροι*, on the other hand (ver. 13), are certainly introduced with only a brief description; but it is evident who they were from the contrast implied to the Hellenists mentioned in ver. 5, and also from their character. As far as regards everything else, all is clear and connected. The narrative makes no claim to have been composed by an eye-witness, and there is, therefore, the less reason that any want of precision should invalidate its credibility. The style of the narrative, in vers. 6–12, has also been considered too poetical or rhetorical to be historically faithful. But although the language, in harmony with the festal character of the event, rises to a somewhat higher tone, still it does not bear the stamp of any intentional composition and modification with this view. Certainly, in the enumeration of the various nations, every individual name does not perhaps lay claim to have originally shared in the event; but this would not render the account unhistorical. If the names had been artificially fabricated and put together, those provinces would surely *not* have been named, the languages of which differ only as regards dialect. For the very reason that the event was one of a character to form an epoch, it is very probable that the author of the Acts of the Apostles, having met with some of the old Palestine Christians who had been in union with the Church at

Jerusalem from the very beginning, had been able to acquire an exact knowledge of the facts of the event, so as subsequently to describe it. A fact of the kind described is, however, a necessity for us, if it is only to enable us to explain the active ministry of the apostles.

This event, in its miraculous aspect, has excited the same objections as the whole history of Jesus Himself; and hence arise the attempts to pronounce it to be either an historical or ideal myth. The former of these ideas was brought about, it is said, by referring the "speaking with tongues" in the Pentecostal miracle to the same phenomenon in the Corinthian Church, which, by a mythical growth, was gradually converted into a speaking in *foreign* tongues. According to the other view, the narrative was an arbitrary copy of the miracle of the Sinaitic lawgiving, as described in Jewish tradition; and the event was a symbol of Christian universalism. But, as regards the latter view, in the first place, it cannot be proved that this tradition was known, or even framed, in the days of the primitive apostolic community. It has been thought, with regard to the description in the *Midrashim*, according to which the word which proceeded from Sinai was divided into seventy tongues, although uttered in only one voice, and was heard by seventy nations, each in its mother tongue, that traces of it might evidently be found in Philo. But the passages in question, on closer consideration, say nothing which could lead us to infer any allusion to an utterance in various tongues, or to an extension of the Sinaitic lawgiving beyond the limits of the Jewish nation. The view taken appears to be more of a spiritual character. Neither can the passage in Heb. ii. 2-4 lead to any such connection of ideas; for the *μερίσμοι πνεύματος ἁγίου* are nothing but the distribution of the gifts of the Spirit. But, even supposing that the tradition extended so far back, still the question arises, whether the narrative we are considering can be a copy of it. Of course, it cannot be said that the account is wanting in certain universalistic ideas, which are not to be presupposed at such an early time in the district of Palestine, in which the narrative doubtless originated. But this idea requires much limitation; for, notwithstanding the many difficulties the universalistic idea had to grapple with (cf. Acts x. and xi.), there are very early traces of its development (cf. Acts vi.-viii.). Universalism is certainly evident in the narra-

tive, and it is indeed difficult not to see it, only it is not in the Jewish shape; and this it is which renders its derivation from the above-named Jewish tradition an impossible idea. According to this tradition, a voice was to be expected from heaven, which would be understood by different men in their mother tongues. Instead of this, we have in our narrative the apostles speaking humanly in these tongues. There is no trace in it of the conception of a unity of language, as a contrast to the confusion of tongues at Babel, to which the Jewish idea appears to have tended. The external becomes an internal matter; and we see the variety of form removed only in the oneness of the Spirit. And in this we stand on original Christian ground; and the character of the narrative certifies to its originality. If we also add the facts, that the first apostolical preaching was linked on to this event, and that all the turning-points of the first days of Christianity depended upon a matter of fact which personally affected individuals, and elevated them to a higher stage of Christian life and thought, we shall find therein an important guarantee for the occurrence itself, which is thus presented as a matter of the highest probability in an historical point of view.

The view that our narrative is an *historical myth*, that is, originated by means of an *amplification of the speaking with tongues*, mentioned in the Epistle to the Corinthians, leads us to the second class of difficulties in the comprehension of the event, which arise from a comparison with the above-named allied phenomenon. That a speaking with tongues existed in the apostolical Church as a gift of the Holy Ghost, is placed beyond all doubt by chaps. xii. and xiv. of the first Epistle to the Corinthians. It there says, *γλώσσαις λαλεῖν* (ch. xii. 30, xiv. 5, 6, 18, 23, 39), and also *γλώσση λαλεῖν* (ch. xiv. 2, 4, 27), and *γλώσσαν ἔχειν* (ch. xiv. 26). The words *γλώσσαις λαλεῖν* occur also in Acts x. 46 and xix. 6, more completely expressed by *ἐτέραις γλώσσαις* in ch. ii. 4, and *καιναῖς γλώσσαις* in Mark xvi. 17. But the "speaking with tongues" in the Corinthian Church was—thus much, at least, is certain—not a speaking in *unknown* or *foreign* tongues. This latter view was one to which men were misled, in perhaps very early times, by the parallel in Acts ii. According to 1 Cor. xiv. 13–15, 18 (cf. Acts x. 46), it was a praising of God, something that existed between God and the devotionalist alone (ver. 28), and was unintelligible to, and

unprofitable for the hearers, unless it was interpreted (ch. xiv. 2-6). It is compared to the uncertain note of an instrument, which is not recognised so as to be understood (ch. xiv. 7 f., 10 f.). To unbelievers it might appear as madness (ver. 23). But it was edifying, by means of interpretation, either by some other (ver. 27), or by the speaker himself (ver. 13). But this interpretation depended on a peculiar gift of the Spirit (ch. xii. 10, 30). The internal state of one speaking with tongues was a state of life in the *πνεῦμα*, and not in the *νοῦς*; consequently, in the spirit in its directly inward character, unmodified by reflection, or any relation to the world without (ch. xiv. 14 f., 19). But it was not a state involving a loss of consciousness; for the speaker was himself edified. And with the gift of tongues that of interpretation might be united, although not always and necessarily. Added to this, the apostle gives precepts in respect to this state, which precepts would have had no sense if referring to an unconscious position. It is, therefore, a state of impletion with the *πνεῦμα*, so that the spirit, pervaded by a sense of the mighty deeds of the divine grace in Christ, is affected in the element of its most inward character, and gives utterance to the fulness and life of its internal feeling and perception, using a mode of expression which, without interpretation, would be unintelligible to others. It must have been something quite subjective and individual, but not to an extent which prevented the sense and signification of it from being interpreted by means of another gift. Between the speaker with tongues and the interpreter a peculiar relation was brought about through the Spirit. The external aspect of the matter has given rise to the most varied suppositions. Thus much, at least, is in the first place certain, that there was in Corinth no speaking in *foreign* tongues; for, as before mentioned, the apostle *compares* the "speaking with tongues" to a speaking in a foreign language (1 Cor. xiv. 10, 11); and two identical things cannot be compared. Added to this, he looks upon the "speaking with tongues" as a thing absolutely unintelligible *per se*. Nevertheless, all the interpretations turn upon either a speaking in foreign tongues acquired by learning, or upon a miracle of tongues, consisting either in the speaking itself or in the hearing. It has been thought to be an imperfect speaking and stammering,—a speaking merely with the tongue in inarticulate sounds; but these ideas are wholly without proof. Others

have thought that it was an obsolete or highly poetical style of phraseology, or language expressed in unusual and strange words, perhaps derived from different dialects, or merely language distinguished by its inspiration. *Γλῶσσα* may perhaps occur for a single unusual expression in this sense, but we have no authentic proof of its use for an entire statement, even apart from the New Testament use of the language. We are, therefore, as regards the explanation of the word, left to the two significations, tongue and language. Unquestionably the word *γλῶσσα*, in the apostle's mode of expression, often has the signification of *tongue*; thus, 1 Cor. xiv. 21, cf. xiii. 1 (as, on the other hand, in the account in Acts ii., the audible phenomenon is in evident relation to the symbol which was visible, namely, to the tongues of fire). But if it cannot be thought to be a stammering with the tongue without sense, because only the *πνεῦμα* and the *νοῦς*, the contemplation in the spirit and the reflection of the understanding, are contrasted with one another, we shall have to adhere to the fundamental meaning of the word, and shall then have to look upon the more complete expression in Acts ii. 4 and Mark xvi. 17 as the original phrase. It has been objected to this, that Paul is perhaps to be looked upon as the older author. But the latter might easily avail himself of the abbreviated expression, using it in a matter of daily life; whilst the later author, as an historian, would be, on the contrary, induced to go back to the full original expression.

The original sense, therefore, of the expression doubtless was (corresponding with the passage Mark xvi. 17), that the Spirit which worked in the disciples created in them a new form of language. And we must doubtless look upon the Corinthian speaking with tongues as being of such a kind that he who spake formed for himself a language of his own, and that each had one peculiar to himself. Hence we can form a judgment as to the relation existing between the speaking with tongues on the day of Pentecost and the Corinthian phenomenon. Certainly there is no doubt that the two phenomena actually coincide in a fundamental character common to both. In both alike the speaking with tongues took place in *φωναῖς* which were unintelligible to the common hearer; in both alike, too, it appeared as the effect of the divine *πνεῦμα*. The unknown tongue in the Acts of the Apostles was, however, that of some historically existing system of language; but this was not the case in

Corinth. But this difference does not do away with the characteristic common to both, that it was a miraculous phenomenon of an essentially new character. The phenomenon in Corinth must be classed among the number of miraculous, spiritual gifts quite suited to the character of Christianity, which everywhere presents itself as a new epoch of spiritual life. Analogies to it may be found in various kinds of religious ecstasies, especially within Christianity itself. According to the testimony of Irenæus, this phenomenon extended into the history of the second century, appearing with special power among the Montanists. Similar phenomena have existed even in the later days of the Christian Church down to our own century, especially among certain of the English sects. The gift of the Corinthian community stood, however, on higher ground, especially in being combined with the power of interpretation. Although, from the purport of 1 Cor. xiv., we must look upon the usual form of speaking with tongues as a speaking in an altogether new and peculiar language, and, apart from its interpretation, absolutely unintelligible; still, in 1 Cor. xiv. 18, the existence of a quantitative distinction in this gift is intimated. And thus a transition might well take place into a speaking in a really strange tongue, which was perhaps only a momentary phenomenon. Looking at the internal precedent of the Pentecostal event, we might justly expect some such peculiar expression of this gift of the Spirit, which subsequently became the criterion of the communication of the Spirit (cf. Acts x. 46, xi. 15-18; perhaps also viii. 15-19); and in this peculiar expression it was not the outer aim, but the symbolical meaning which was to be looked for. Thus this particular phenomenon, being only a peculiar stamp of the gift of the Spirit, affords an explanation of the name which is common to both. It also explains why the author of the Acts of the Apostles, who must have been so ready to compare the phenomenon of which he must have been aware with the fact which he had to relate, was led to indicate so exactly, and to bring forward so prominently, the specific character of the event he described. The argument drawn from this against the historical nature of the occurrence is thus done away with. Its origin can hardly be looked for in the already existing idea of universalism, unless cause and effect are confounded; and, by the importance of it, the great commence-

ment of the public standing-forth of the apostles is most easily rendered historically intelligible.

§ 47. *The Characteristics of the New Life.*

The spiritual life which, after a foundation of this kind on the feast of Pentecost, we find existing in the apostolic community, and, owing to the communication of the Spirit, not limited to the apostles only, but extending to all believers (cf. Acts ii. 1, 4, and i. 14, 15), was, in the first place, *independent* in its nature,—a life which, by means of the Spirit, passed from Christ to His people. This we bring forward as a biblico-historical, and not as a dogmatical proposition. It was independent, as being free from all human subordination, and unconstrained by the guidance of any human person, or by the authority of any human law of the latter, and as taking its rise solely in the hearts and minds of these believers. That this life was originated by the Holy Ghost through Christ, they themselves were fully conscious, and thus expressed themselves. This was the case with Peter at the feast of Pentecost (Acts ii. 33, cf. 38), and also in his referring the healing of the lame man to the power of Christ communicated to them through the Holy Ghost (Acts iii. 15, 16, iv. 10); cf. also the declaration before the Sanhedrim (Acts v. 30–33). Paul also expresses the same idea, ch. xxii. and xxvi.; and we find it everywhere laid down in the apostolic epistles.

This origin is also vouched for by the nature of the new life, and the proofs afforded by its outward actions. It has the stamp of the very life of Jesus, as a life in God; the stamp, too, of the most decided self-denial and contempt of the world, and of a practical self-surrender to God. It is in itself a faith in Jesus as the Christ, sure and firm as a rock, and a certain hope in Him and the victory of His cause. It is a life of fervent and self-sacrificing brotherly love, on which the firmest fellowship is based (Acts ii. and iv.). All this is accompanied by a clear display of the Spirit, who unmistakeably shone forth, at least in certain individuals, as in many of the apostles. A Paul was a partaker, although in a higher measure, of the gift of tongues, and had his solemn ecstasies (2 Cor. xii.); and yet in practical life he was a clear-sighted man, capable of a vigorous and comprehensive activity. In his teaching, too, he so combined the sagacity of a rabbi of the school of Gamaliel with the spirit of the Christian, that he

has bequeathed to us the most cultivated and dialectically sustained system of apostolic doctrine. How far removed from all idle fanaticism, how entirely practical and circumspect, is the whole tendency of the apostolic life generally! There arose in the apostles and believers of that time a *new conception* of the promised salvation, and of the entry into the same by means of a new creation and a new birth. They now understand the person of the Redeemer in conformity with the extraordinary turn which His life had taken in consequence of His resurrection and ascension before their eyes. But all these ideas, which were now formed in them, could not have been attained to, unless at the same time their moral life had been elevated to a higher degree of power. The Jew of Palestine, in whose idea God and man were so far asunder, who looked upon any confusion in the distinction between them as only idolatry, now rose to a contemplation of the unity of the divine and the human as it existed in Jesus. The *individualities* of the apostles appear to have been subject to peculiar *transformations*. We find this to be the case, if we compare the public appearance and conduct of the apostles in their present position with their previous condition: in the case of Paul, with the period before his conversion; and, as regards Peter, John, and James, with the time of their intercourse with the Lord. The characteristic distinctions in the *nationalities* of the disciples likewise appear done away with in the community of their mutual faith. Some more mighty distinction had superseded the great divisions of masses of men in ancient times. The inflexible spirit of the Jews, and the pride of the Roman people, which, as opposed in deadly hatred, approached a war of annihilation, were broken down by the rock-melting flash of the Spirit. The unprecedented idea, that Jews and Gentiles were to be brethren, without the Gentiles becoming Jews, found its fulfilment in the Pauline community. This universalism of Christianity approved itself by its *power of attraction* to all existing forms of civilisation. The Jews were allied to it both by their ethical monotheism, and also by their hopes of a theocratical Messiah. And although their inflexible monotheism, as well as the material colouring of their hopes and the nature of their sects, kept many from Christianity, still all those remained open to it who waited for the salvation of Israel. Even among the heathen, sufficient points of connection were not wanting. It

approved itself especially to the facility of reception, and the increased and deeper susceptibility in cases where the civilisations of Palestine and Greece were united, as in Paul, or even in John, if we take account of the latter's long subsequent sojourn at Ephesus. In the same way, all the *external social relations* are altered in their character; as we see in the epistles, the ideas of the apostles as to marriage and family ties at once assume an entirely Christian form. Monogamy becomes the Christian rule; and the most decided step is thus taken to shape the relations of the female sex in due harmony with its true human dignity, without going to the other extreme. The subordination of children, as laid down in the Mosaic law and the civil law of the Roman empire, is strictly maintained; but even this relation is softened down and transformed by the definition that the obedience is to be "in the Lord" (Eph. vi. 1). The children are become joint-possessors with their parents of the gift of salvation. But the power of the new spirit influences still further the customs of civil life. The partition-wall between the freeman and the slave is broken down: the latter is no longer a possession. Numbers of slaves become, within a few years, free partakers in Christ. The master and his slave are brethren, and yet they still remain, one a ruler and one a servant (1 Cor. vii. 21 ff.), but both in brotherly love. The relations of the rich and poor, high and low, follow the same rule. The "*cruce*" of political wisdom is surmounted; the problem is solved, in a spiritually moral sense, by the antithesis, that he that is of low degree is to glory in his exaltation, and he that is high in his lowliness (Isa. i. 9, 10). Political life, too, begins to assume a new shape, by means of the axiom that power is of God, and that on this account obedience results, not from fear alone, but from the effects of conscience. The relation to the powers that be, is therefore elevated out of the sphere of law into a religious and moral connection.

All these things, however, which belong to the general character of the Christian life, are manifest in the apostolic period in a way that is peculiar, but at the same time quite in harmony with the *commencement* of Christian life. The first appearance and outward indications and development of the life in this period show us this life as the foundation of the Church. We meet with a peculiar freshness of life manifested, on the one hand, both in feeling and action, and, on the other, in the teaching; and this proves

the *originality* of this life, based as it was partly on a direct personal intercourse with Christ, and partly on the communication of the Holy Spirit, and existing in men and communities who had hitherto lived in an essentially different element, either Jewish or heathen,—in whom, therefore, the contrast of the spirit proceeding from Jesus Christ must have appeared with peculiar force. The intensity of the powers thus communicated, apart from the special characteristics of the gifts to be subsequently mentioned, is expressed in the fulness of the *χαρίσματα* generally, in which a distinction between the miraculous and the non-miraculous can scarcely be carried out. Some of these fell to the lot of all believers, the manifestation of them certifying visibly to the possession of the *πνεῦμα* (cf. Acts x. 46, viii. 15–19, xi. 15–18); some, however, were only granted to individuals (cf. 1 Cor. xii. and xiv.). From these chapters we may gather that we ought to look upon them as sanctified, amplified, and renovated natural gifts, and that the Spirit always laid hold of some point of connection in the personality of the believer. Hence arose the great diversity of the various gifts which appear to have prevailed in different communities. A twofold phenomenon is, however, connected with the peculiar and original power of the apostolic life: first, a certain ecstatic state, in which the spiritual life manifests itself in its direct inwardness at certain times, in certain persons and communities, of which class was the speaking with tongues; next, the miraculous element which we meet with in the apostolic period. Miracles took place as regarded the apostles themselves, such as the release, Acts v. 19, against which it cannot be brought as an objection, that in the trial which followed no accusation was laid against them as to the escape, as in the narrative that matter only which was essential for the Christian cause was summarily given. There were also numerous miracles done by the apostles themselves, some of which, it is expressly related, were wrought in the name of Jesus. There were, too, miraculous powers which are described as gifts of the Holy Spirit (Acts iii. 6, 16, iv. 9, 10, ii. 43, v. 12, 16, vi. 8, viii. 6–13, ix. 2 ff., xv. 12, xxviii. 8, 9). In addition to these texts, we have testimony as to these miraculous deeds and powers in the epistles of St. Paul (2 Cor. xii. 12; 1 Cor. xii. 28, cf. ix. 10; Rom. xv. 18, 19). By these passages, the miraculous character of the apostolic period is generally confirmed; and these miraculous deeds

and powers are described in their internal connection with the communication of the Spirit, and therefore as integral elements of the apostolical life. These miracles are not, however, peculiar to the apostolical age. We hear of them in the second and third centuries, but of less frequent occurrence (cf. Justin Martyr and Origen); and this is in conformity with the gradual disappearance of the communication of the Spirit. In the centuries which followed we find the number of miraculous occurrences again increasing; and this may be justly ascribed by criticism to a deficiency in that soberness which characterized the apostolical period, without allowing the inference that throughout these centuries miraculous events could not have taken place in the Christian life.

We may gather from the New Testament that, as regards the new Christian life, the apostles stood in the same position as other believers. Both had received the Holy Spirit as a common bond of union (Acts xv. 8); and the general character of its outpouring was proved by the teaching and life of those who were not apostles. Thus, in Stephen (Acts vi., vii.), also in Barnabas in the Church of Antioch (Acts xi. 22-26, xiii. 1), and subsequently Apollos in Corinth (Acts xviii. 24-28; cf. 1 Cor. iii. 5, 6). Indeed, they were not apostles who were the first, after the persecution of the Christians at the time of Stephen, to preach the gospel to those who were not Jews (Acts viii. 4, v. 25, 26, 40); and we find apostolical authority at Jerusalem ascribed to James, the brother of the Lord, who probably was not an apostle. But, on the other hand, the apostles had a pre-eminence, in virtue of Jesus' special charge to them of preaching the gospel and founding the Church, and the authorization vouchsafed to them for this purpose. In conformity with this, they looked upon the office of teaching as their peculiar charge, for the sake of which they withdrew from the external business of the community (Acts vi. 4); and, with this peculiar charge, praying for the community was indissolubly united. They stand in the first rank of those endowed with the Spirit (cf. 1 Cor. xii. 28; Eph. iv. 11). With the office of instruction and the duty of prayer was also joined the ordering of certain regulations, in carrying out which the community also took a part (cf. Acts vi. 2-6). It was the apostles who took the lead in the development of the Christian life; and in them the Christian life chiefly showed its independent character, as something which exercised a special power of attrac-

tion over others. The names of the apostles and their authority constitute the foundation on which the canon is based; the whole of the Church which followed them were conscious of resting on this apostolical foundation; and this is in entire harmony with the position which Jesus gave to the apostles. But by this pre-eminence of the apostles any eminent endowment of another was by no means precluded. The Spirit that existed in them was the same as that in all the believers generally. It was no natural prerogative of the apostles; but the Lord had poured it out on all, and destined it for all. Therefore, although we may not look upon them as equal to the rest as regards their actual position, still it is difficult to lay down any absolute distinction. In a case where the apostleship which resulted from the intercourse with Jesus did not suffice to call forth some particular step of development in the Church, we find a man entrusted with a peculiar apostolic charge who had previously not been an apostle, and, indeed, was not a Christian. Thus, in the sphere of the new life, neither the counsel of man, nor human calculation and power, but the Lord Himself and His Spirit, remained the guiding principle.

It was, moreover, necessary that the Spirit of Christ should stamp its nature on the apostles. He approved Himself to them as the Spirit which remodelled and transformed every individuality. This transformation, although not entirely obliterating the individuality, is that which produced the organic life which they possessed in common; and we can follow out the traces of it in the life of these men as far as it is known to us. In all this, however, the Spirit remains independent of any human arbitrariness or calculation, "blowing where it listeth." We may specially notice this in the call of the Apostle Paul, when, through the influence of the Spirit, a new instrument was obtained, who in the hour of need stood forth with full apostolic power. It is just on this occasion, when He exercises so free a rule, that He comes before us in all His complete objectivity as the Spirit of the living Redeemer, glorified in heaven. It is not merely the living Jesus who guides the Church in the historical recollection and idea of believers, but it is the glorified Lord who rules in and over it, who in the propagation of Christianity, apart from human activity, contends for His own cause among mankind themselves. Thus He calls a Paul, and enlightens him with His light, so that he can stand

at the head of the Church ; but this is not done without the co-operation of believers, and the addition of the knowledge existing in the world as to the historical appearance of the Redeemer. This knowledge, Paul, even as a persecutor, possessed perhaps to some extent, and was therefore able to grasp the signification of the word which came to him from above ; and the Church was brought near to him in the person of Ananias. Thus, even here, the historical connection was not quite done away with ; although this interposition falls quite into the background as compared with the principal cause, the Lord and His Spirit. And this very Spirit proves itself, by the life and work of the apostles, to have been the Holy Spirit. There are the most speaking proofs of this. The victory of Christianity which is introduced into the world is the victory of truth ; and this victory is brought about by the agency of the first instruments,—an agency opposed to the spirit of the world. In the apostolical age we see the operation of these instruments, which, although not free from human weakness, were nevertheless devoted to the Lord, and active in His spirit. The self-denial which the Lord laid down as the first law is manifested in them, and their ministry becomes a ministry in love and wisdom. The fruits thereof are, however, for the Church, the substance of apostolical Christianity, which is for all time the authentic rule for that which is truly Christian, and its firm foundation for all futurity ; and this we have to consider as the work of the apostles.

This spirit was thus pre-eminently manifest in the four most prominent personages in the period we are considering, *James, Peter, Paul*, and *John*, the pillars of the apostolical Church ; although Paul was not originally an apostle, and with regard to James, it is at least doubtful whether in the narrower sense he belonged to the apostolic circle. But he was one of the most distinguished ministers and leaders of the Church of Jerusalem, as he is described in the Acts of the Apostles (ch. xv. 13, xii. 17, xxi. 18) and by Paul (Gal. i. 19, ii. 9, 12). And although he might not have been actually an apostle, we must ascribe to him (as to Paul, although in consequence of another kind of guidance) apostolic authority, and must class him among the four most important men of this period. Peter, on the contrary, had worked from the very beginning in Jerusalem with undis-

puted apostolical authority, and had founded the Church there; and although in the course of time he appears to have there given place to James, he began more than any to propagate Christianity far and wide. John, although, in accordance with his contemplative tendency, not so externally active, was nevertheless (Gal. ii. 9) one of the chiefs of the ancient Church, and subsequently, at least after the destruction of Jerusalem, worked in Asia Minor, especially in Ephesus, surviving all the apostles, and living to the end of the century. The position and activity of St. Paul will be shown by the review of the course of development of the apostolic Church. These four men are those principally brought before us as the chief agents, not only of the actual guidance of the Church, but also of the apostolical teaching, in which the Christianity of this time is stamped almost as vividly and evidently as in the life itself.

II. THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE APOSTOLICAL COMMUNITY.

§ 48. *The First Stages of Christian Fellowship.*

The communication of the Spirit was also the foundation of a *community*, because there was a number of men to whom one and the same *life* was given. And the more powerfully this was manifest at the very commencement, the more decidedly it was distinguished from any worldly wisdom, and the more forcible was the power of attraction by which individuals were linked together. We therefore see that, even in the apostolical period, from the beginning onwards, there was but slight preparation for this community: everything seemed to proceed from the internal impulse of the Spirit, and to be of organic growth. The Church seemed to be a tree in the very sense in which Jesus had used the figure: it grew through the inward intensity of the power inherent in its seed. The community is outwardly manifested as a fellowship in an inward and outward life, both in a religious and civil point of view; and this is developed with strength sufficient to frame itself into a form, at first in the simplest way, and not according to any prescribed plan, but just as occasion seemed to require. We learn this from the statements in the Acts as to

the earliest life of the Church at Jerusalem (cf. Acts ii. 42 ff., iv. 32 ff., v. 12 ff., v. 42): "And the multitude of them that believed were of one heart and one soul." But the internal bond of union was also outwardly manifested, for they often assembled together in the temple, in Solomon's porch, and also in private houses, where they especially united in common meals, and, as it appears, celebrated together the feast in memory of Jesus. Added to this was their joint care for their poor; in short, from the very commencement onwards, the infant Church bore the distinct stamp of a life in common. It was of considerable importance that from the first a local centre-point was provided for this community, which was essentially helped by the concentration thereby caused. This place was Jerusalem. Here the apostles were at first gathered together, which was a matter of great importance in the development of the Christian teaching; for, by the combination of their testimony, and in consequence of their mutual influence on one another, a more distinct type was formed for the preaching of the gospel, each individual making good his special deficiencies. Thus the pureness of the Christian spirit, both in respect to doctrine and in a moral point of view, was best preserved. But Jerusalem was also the best fitted place for an increase in disciples. This city was not only the centre of the Jewish nation, but also exercised a considerable power of attraction for those who were not Jews. Thus everything combined to render successful the efforts of the energies which were united in it. But the infant Church was, by a gradual course of development, to break through the veil by which it had been concealed, and to some extent sheltered, in Jerusalem, and was by degrees to attain an independent position, no longer subordinate to the Jewish nationality. This course of development exhibits three stages, which we can distinguish in the accounts in the Acts. A fourth stage may, in addition, be perceived in the later books of the New Testament, especially those of John; but it is only with respect to the three first that we possess any detailed historical knowledge.

The *first stage of development* embraces the earliest days of the Church at Jerusalem down to the persecution in which Stephen was a sacrifice; and the Christian community was from the first introduced entirely into the Jewish nationality. The Church founded by the apostles at Jerusalem was constituted chiefly of actual Jews; even the Hellenists, who, as we find from Acts vi.,

belonged to it at the beginning, were still Jews of the *διασπορά*. The disciples resulting from Jesus' own ministry, who lived scattered about in Galilee and Perea, were Jews. Indeed, the Jewish nationality was the natural starting-point of the Christian Church. This was in full harmony with the deep connection existing between the old and new covenants. Jesus was the expected Messiah. He Himself had sprung from the Jews, and in Him was the primeval promise to be fulfilled, that from this nation should proceed a salvation for all mankind. Therefore, from the very first, in the proselytizing discourses of the apostles, so great a stress is laid on the point that salvation belonged to the Jews (Acts iii. 25 f., etc.). But this identification was a limited one, and was conditional on the susceptibility of this nation for the perfected salvation. Where this was wanting, a contrast immediately arose, and became evident in the belief of the Christians. The latter had hoped for the promised Messianic salvation, and believed that it had appeared in Jesus as the Messiah. They thus naturally stood opposed to those who did not share in this belief, and indeed denied it. And this opposition must have been all the more distinctly felt, as this denial proceeded from the mass of the people and their chiefs. The earliest apostolic discourses refer, therefore, to this fact (Acts ii. 23, iii. 14 f.); and the wider the gulf existing between the believers in Jesus and the rest of the Jews, the more natural became the requirement of a change of mind and conversion on the part of unbelievers who were to become fitted for salvation (Acts ii. 38, iii. 19). In this very respect,—that is, as regards the development of this contrast,—the original concentration at Jerusalem of the life of the community becomes a matter of great importance. In this place the might of the nation, with all the reminiscences of past hostilities and the present enmity, was ever present before the eyes of the first Christians. Here, too, the sense of the contrast would tend to consolidate the peculiar Christian consciousness, and became a guarantee that the latter would not become dulled and die away.

The non-susceptibility of the Jewish character as regards the gospel, was, however, specially stamped upon the various sects of the period. With these the Christian community would first have to come in conflict: it thus encountered the Sadducees and Pharisees. The opposition between Sadduceism and Christianity must have

first become manifest. Even the first apostolic discourses opposed this sect, by closely connecting the gospel with the Old Testament prophecies, and showing that the latter were fulfilled in the former (Acts ii., iii., v.). Again, the fact on which Christian faith was founded was the corroboration of Jesus by His resurrection. The apostolic testimony of this fact and its application were directly opposed to the Sadducean doctrine of the absolute mortality of man. If we also consider that, as Gamaliel's example shows (who certainly spoke, in the first place, from motives of worldly wisdom, but yet must have been convinced that the Christian teaching was not opposed to God), many of the non-Sadducean Jews, especially those of the Pharisaical party, entertained more friendly feelings towards Christianity,—indeed, in the course of time, showed an inclination for it (cf. Acts xv. 5),—we may be able to explain the growing aversion of the Sadducees to the new faith. From the value which they attached to the belief in a resurrection, the Pharisees must have been attracted by the preaching of a Risen One. Many of them, indeed, must certainly have been also attracted by the moral earnestness of Christianity; for the members of this sect were not all hypocrites, and many of them were certainly real zealots for the law. And, on the contrary, this moral character of the Church and its teaching was the very thing to repel the Sadducees. From all this, we need hardly wonder when we read (Acts iv. 1, v. 17) that the Sadducean party took a chief share in the first hostile movement made against the community, that is, against Peter and John, in consequence of the miracle wrought by the latter (Acts iii. and iv.). The fact that the high-priestly family belonged at that time to the Sadducean party is confirmed by Josephus. We meet with an echo of this division and of the original state of things at a later date in the life of the Apostle Paul (Acts xxiii. 6–9), when the latter, taken prisoner in Jerusalem, obtained his liberty for the moment by prudently availing himself of the disunion existing between the Pharisees and Sadducees.

But an opposition to the Pharisaical element was soon to develop itself in the apostolical community,—an opposition which was destined to have much further-reaching consequences. The Christians still kept up their relation with the temple, and often assembled there. The friends of legal piety must have felt pleased with their conduct. Nevertheless, the time soon came when the

distinction between the freedom of the Christian spirit and the trammels of the law made itself felt, and Christians became conscious of the incongruity of the legal worship, and still more of the adherence to tradition. This, as may naturally be supposed, took place first among the Hellenists. These were from the very first both the most inclined, and the best qualified, to grasp and give prominence to the cosmopolitan element in Christianity. We find the Hellenist and Hebrew Christians first contrasted in Acts vi., on the occasion of a dispute between the two parties. According to ch. vi. 1, the number of the disciples had considerably increased, and it had gradually become a difficult matter to carry out the relief of the poor without certain special social forms. The Hellenists thought they were neglected; and their dissatisfaction induced the apostles (already sufficiently occupied in teaching) to propose the institution of a diaconate. Among the seven men selected for this office, on whom the apostles laid their hands, there were certainly several Hellenists, as Nicolas, a proselyte of Antioch (ver. 5); in fact, all the seven have Greek names. At their head stands Stephen, a man full of grace and power, and probably himself an Hellenist. He entered into a discussion with the school of the Alexandrians, Cyrenians, and Libertines. Stirred up by his manifest superiority to them, and also, as it appears, by his anti-Pharisaical tendencies, these men make an accusation against Stephen (Acts vi. 11-14), which, from the description of those who partook in it, and from its whole character, points to a Pharisaical impulse, and no mere Sadducean origin. For they accused him of blasphemy against Moses, God, the temple, and the law, and especially of maintaining that Jesus of Nazareth would destroy the temple and change the Mosaic institutions. Stephen delivers a public testimony for the Lord before the Sanhedrim, a discourse which we have in Acts vii. It is for the most part of historical purport, briefly surveying the whole history of the nation, with a partly apologetic and partly polemic aim. The apologetic element, however, gives way before the controversial in the ardent, inspired, and doubtless youthful orator. He comprehends the whole purport of his historical statement in his bitter reproach against the nation (vers. 51-53) on account of their unbelief and stubbornness against God. But the conclusion of the discourse can only be a matter of

conjecture, as Stephen was not allowed to finish it. This occurrence, and the accusation itself, are in full harmony with the then existing position of things. The witnesses were false, but, notwithstanding their misrepresentations, the words laid to his charge may have been genuine. Stephen himself does not deny them. But even in this case, all he had said had been previously brought forward by Jesus Himself, and must have been remembered in the community (cf. Matt. xxiv., xxvi. 61 ; John ii. 19, iv. 22-26, as to the end of the temple). This attitude on the part of Jesus is, beyond all doubt, historical ; for the fact of the hostility of the rulers of the people against Him, so irrefragably attested by His death upon the cross, would be otherwise unintelligible. Besides, a Jewish-Christian record, like Matthew's Gospel, would assuredly never have adopted such words, unless compelled thereto by the force of historical truth. Under these circumstances, Jesus' words must have lived in the memory of some of the members of the community ; and there is considerable internal probability that such a one as Stephen would fully adopt them, if, from his discourse, and the intimations given about him, we may be permitted to fancy him as an ardent young Hellenist. And his opponents, among them Cilicians such as Paul, as inflexible zealots for the law, doubtless discovered in the doctrine of salvation in Christ an antagonism to the law. The way, too, in which Stephen spoke is internally and historically probable. His discourse is unfettered in its character, and spoken in a spirit of excitement, indeed of high inspiration ; not artificially framed, but flowing from a vivid consciousness of the circumstances. The aim and purport are both decidedly anti-Pharisaical, but nevertheless the statement is closely connected with Jewish tradition, just as the double-sided position in the then existing state of the Jewish-Christian community would lead us to expect. Stephen's discourse, by its animated tone, is sharply distinguished from the mild language of Peter at the feast of Pentecost, who almost seemed to look upon the hostility to the Lord as something past, and to presuppose some alteration of mind ; also from the deference with which the apostles defended themselves in chs. iv. and v., which rendered it easy for Gamaliel to speak in their favour, although in a very indifferent way. It is distinguished, too, from the calmer mode in which Paul in ch. xiii. developes a similar

line of thought. In Stephen's discourse, everything bears a character of individuality, and is adapted to the exigency of the moment. For this very reason, and because this moment was and became so important a one, it is easily conceivable that both the purport and tone of this discourse should be retained in memory for Christian record. This occurrence became an epoch. The consciousness of the opposition existing between the Christian faith and the institutions of Judaism was now openly expressed; and the death of its first martyr indelibly impressed this turn of events on the memory of the Church. The persecution which ensued, and appeared to shake its very foundations, could only have assisted in its further development.

This event was the means of bringing on in the Christian community a *second stage of development*, which opened the path for essential progress, although it was, in the first place, only a stage of transition. The Church now finds among its members those who are not Jews, and attains the knowledge that Gentiles are also called to be partakers in Christ's salvation, without, indeed, being previously circumcised, *i.e.* becoming Jews. This was a decided step in advance towards the complete independence of the Christian Church. But the first steps in this direction were taken with but a dormant consciousness of their high importance, and without any preliminary human reflection. The recognition of the Gentiles was gradually developed from the facts of the life itself. At the time of Stephen's death the persecution arose (Acts viii. 1), and a light opened on the mass of the people, showing the great conflict of principle which was in question, although their zeal was perhaps first directed against those who expressed themselves as Stephen did. But the more he was honoured (ch. viii. 2), and the more his principles were embraced, the more their hostility was increased, in the exercise of which Saul of Tarsus is mentioned as peculiarly active. Under these circumstances, the Christians are for the most part scattered over the surrounding regions; but the apostles themselves still remain in Jerusalem. The *πάντες* in ch. viii. 1 is not to be taken in a strictly numerical sense, but that the body of the community, as a whole, was scattered. Among those that were scattered, there were, however, many who possessed the ability of preaching the gospel, and, in conformity with the general tendency of the spirit in the Church, felt impelled to bear witness of their faith; for the

consciousness of believers was already thus far strengthened and matured. Some still remained in the land of Judea (ch. viii. 1), and by these the believers dwelling here and there in these regions were comforted and increased. Those who went farther, to Phenice, Cyprus, and Antioch, confined their preaching, we are told, to the Jews in the *διασπορά* (Acts xi. 19). But the decisive step took place in Samaria. It was Philip, one of the seven deacons of the Church of Jerusalem (ch. vi. 5), subsequently called an evangelist (ch. xxi. 8), who came to Samaria, and preached and baptized in a city there with much success. Although the Lord had commanded the apostles to teach all nations, it remained for a long time an undecided point with them in what sense this was to be done. They might well imagine that the transition would be brought about through circumcision, and by means of proselytes. But now an example was afforded which led to further results. Jesus Himself had already found in Samaria a receptive ministerial field (John iv.), and this was now the case with Philip (Acts viii. 5 ff.). When the apostles received the news of this event, they sent Peter and John from Jerusalem as delegates, in answer to whose prayers those who were baptized received the Holy Ghost. After this, the apostles themselves preached the gospel in Samaria (cf. viii. 17, 25). But the Samaritans were a people allied to the Jews in race, and had originally been partakers in the call. At all events, Philip and these apostles did not join in the national feud then existing. Their intercourse with Jesus had freed them from this; and their conduct is a corroboration of the narrative in John iv. But still, in all this, the calling of the actual Gentiles was not openly proclaimed; but this, too, was now done. It first took place (probably) in the case of the eunuch in the service of Candace, queen of the Ethiopians, whom Philip met with in the way (Acts viii. 26-40). This baptism was brought about, as the author of the Acts of the Apostles purposely records, by the interposition of an angel. The following, however, is a still more certain instance: Among the fugitives who were scattered far and wide, there were at least a few (Acts xi. 20, cf. 19) who turned to those who were not Jews, and that in Antioch. These preachers were probably Hellenists, who, from the entire course of their life and education, could not feel so much alienation as regarded the Gentiles. Their labours met with extraordinary success. But ere this took place,

or, at least, ere it became known at Jerusalem, a more decided step was taken, even in the apostolic sphere of operations. If it had not been for this intervening incident, the formation of a Christian community from among the Gentiles might have stirred up a division in the Church, and a double Christianity, a Jewish and a Gentile section, might have arisen. But this rupture was prevented by the control of the Lord of the Church Himself, and His Spirit. Thus it was so ordained that the apostles themselves were impelled to admit Gentiles into the Christian community. Peter had undertaken a journey to visit the churches in Judea, Samaria, etc., and for some time had made Joppa his centre of operations (Acts ix.). The persecution had subsided, and the Christian community began again to enjoy quiet (Acts ix. 31). During this period, it happened that a Roman centurion who was stationed at Cæsarea, the seat of the proconsulate, received directions in a vision to send to Peter. Cornelius is described as a man distinguished by his genuine piety. That he was only a "proselyte of the gate," may be gathered from the whole narrative, and from the conduct of Peter, who expressly contrasts him and his company with the Jews. The Jews, also, who accompanied Peter, spoke and acted in a similar sense (cf. Acts x. 28, 45, xi. 1-3, 18). The message reached Peter when he was engaged in prayer, and had been overcome by a vision, in which he was summoned to eat Levitically unclean beasts, and had his doubts pacified by a voice, which bade him to consider as clean that which God had cleansed. Peter obeyed the call, and, having preached the gospel to Cornelius and his house, saw them unequivocally endowed with the Spirit; so that all that remained for the apostle to do was to complete God's work by external baptism. Thus Peter himself relates it in his subsequent self-vindication at Jerusalem (Acts xi. 5 ff.). By his words, too, the apostolic body is pacified, and acknowledges the facts in all their mighty results (Acts xi. 18). We are entirely without warrant in throwing any historical doubt on this event, because Paul was the first to assert the great principle of the acceptance of the Gentiles, and not Peter, who, indeed, went so far as to oppose the former apostle. All we gather from the Epistle to the Galatians is, that Paul distinctively looked upon the apostleship to the Gentiles as his settled call, and not that he performed the first overt act in this direction. Peter, also, did not act from his own internal

impulse, but only in consequence of an irresistible divine guidance. His subsequent vacillating behaviour by no means proves that he could not have had the power to follow such a guidance. Also his conduct at Antioch does not prove that he merely yielded to Paul for a season, without any personal conviction. Peter yielded to the power of facts; and his being able to deny the conviction which compelled him does not prove that he never had it. There is a more trivial objection, that the reproach in Acts xi. 3 does not go so far as the facts would warrant; but they are all indirectly implied therein. At all events, the whole event had a peculiarly characteristic result as regards Christianity and the apostolic period. In it is shown how the Lord Himself, and His Spirit, opened out a path for the gospel, independently of any human wisdom or judgment; it is shown, too, that Christianity is life, and from this life all doctrine is developed; also that, in the most decisive moments of the apostolic period, the Spirit specially watched over and elevated the Church, widening and enlightening the knowledge of the apostles, who submitted themselves to the Spirit, thus confirming and assuring the unity of the Christian Church. The Church at Jerusalem having thus arrived at a due consciousness of these important circumstances, it was also in a position to see in its proper light the conversion of the uncircumcised Gentiles in Antioch, and, with inward sympathy, to render thanks to the Lord. Thus it took place according to Acts xi. 19-26. They sent Barnabas to Antioch (ver. 22), who beheld the state of things with joy, and made common cause with the other labourers in the conversion of the Gentiles. Immediately proceeding to Tarsus in Cilicia, he brought from thence Paul (who had been in the meantime converted), and introduced him into the freshly-opened field of labour at Antioch. Christianity, in fact, flourished here to such an extent, that from hence the name of "Christian" was spread over the earth. All these occurrences, as they are related in the Acts of the Apostles, carry with them, that is, in the connection of the course of events, their own warranty of truth. There are no grounds for doubting the fact of the early existence of the Gentile Church of Antioch; but this existence is scarcely explicable, except by such a course of development as we have described. The cause of an universal Christianity was not, however, yet triumphant. We soon see a reaction arising; and

much was yet wanting ere a feeling of heartfelt brotherhood could be added to, and infused into the external acceptance of the Gentiles,—ere the newly-opened and mighty mission-call affected the whole body of the community. For this purpose a fresh instrument was necessary. But, without some such preparation as we have described, the ministry of Paul could scarcely be imagined; for it would have had to grapple with insurmountable difficulties. The history which follows, and the new and important stages of development described, constitute a guarantee of the truth of the previous events. Added to this, it would have been perhaps impossible, at a time when the memory of the facts was comparatively fresh, for the author of the Acts of the Apostles to have devised and circulated a distorted representation of the truth.

§ 49. *Shaping of the Christian Community by the Apostle Paul.*

The third stage of development of the apostolical community is manifested by the conduct of the Christian Church, in acting decidedly on the consciousness they had arrived at of the joint-call of the Gentiles, and in endeavouring to maintain and develop their unity and independence by softening down and levelling the contrasts which resulted. The solver of this problem was the Apostle Paul.

In the apostolic body, as hitherto constituted, there was an evident deficiency. None of the existing apostles were well adapted for thoroughly carrying out the conflict with the peculiarities and legality of Judaism. Among those who were styled by Paul (Gal. i. and ii.) as pillars of the Church, there was, in the first place, James, who was surnamed "The Just," because he pre-eminently stamped Christian piety with the Old Testament form. Peter, too, although he submitted to the divine revelation and guidance, did not as yet possess sufficient resolution to be the champion in guiding the Church with indomitable energy to the newly acquired aim. John, who follows next, appears generally, in the history of the apostolic Church, to have interfered but little in the way of action, and, owing to his comparative youth and the prevailing character of his nature, was unfit to fight successfully the battle of the Church. The Apostle Matthias brought no fresh element into the apostolic body: the choice of man was not sufficient for this. So the Lord chose

another instrument, who, labouring with the other apostles in a long course of development, brought the work to its desired end. We first have to consider the mode in which Paul was called, and then how the further development came to pass through his ministry.

When Stephen, the first champion against the Pharisaical spirit of Judaism, was stoned to death by his own nation, *Saul* was present, and took a special pleasure in his end (Acts vii. 58–viii. 1). But the sacrifice bore its fruit; and out of the ashes of Stephen grew up the spirit of a Paul. He who helped to slay the martyr was God's chosen instrument in fulfilling the great task which that martyr had scarcely anticipated. As to the mode and story of his conversion, the apostle himself is the first witness, and the account in the Acts must be compared with his statements. In this the Epistle to the Galatians is of primary importance. Paul begins with the declaration that his apostleship was not of men, or conferred by man, not even, indeed, through human interposition; hence the gospel preached by him was not of men (Gal. i. 1, 11), being neither received from nor taught by men, but solely through the revelation of Jesus Christ. Paul, having originally been an unbeliever and most zealous persecutor of the Church, because an adherent to the traditions of his fathers (ver. 13 ff.), it pleased God to reveal His Son in his inmost being (*ἐν ἐμοί*, ver. 16), that he might preach Him among the heathen. An *ἀποκάλυψις* therefore preceded, and this alone made him an apostle, and enlightened him as to the gospel. Moreover, he had not been in any way dependent on the apostles (vers. 17, 18); for not until three years after did he visit Peter at Jerusalem, and abode there fifteen days. To the churches in Judea he was personally unknown, but they praised God for his conversion and ministry; and the apostles gave to him the right hand of fellowship. This is the sense in which he maintains that his conversion was through Christ alone. Between his Jewish and his Christian life there was no interval. He describes the suddenness of his conversion as a light breaking forth in him (cf. 1 Cor. ix. 1; 2 Cor. iv. 6). The emphatic corroboration of his apostolic authority is that he himself also had seen Christ. As his rivals laid great stress on the visions and revelations which had been afforded them, he, too, is compelled, although reluctantly, to mention those he had received (1 Cor. ix.; 2 Cor.

xii.). His intention in this is most evident from 1 Cor. xv. 8. He there enumerates the witnesses of Jesus' resurrection, and amongst them names himself. According to 1 Cor. ix. 1, he had seen the risen and glorified Jesus, and this was the revelation (Gal. i. 16) by which he suddenly received light in his inmost being, and became entirely changed. With respect to the details of the event, the Acts of the Apostles supplements the apostle's statement, by relating it (ch. ix. 1–22) in connection with all that resulted from the persecution which broke out after Stephen's death. After the death of the martyr, Paul put in action his persecuting zeal, and, when on his way to Damascus with an authority from the high priest to imprison the Christians in that city, he was suddenly shone upon by a heavenly light, and heard the call of the Lord. Being blinded, he fasted and prayed for three days, until in a vision he was directed to Ananias, a Christian of Damascus, who in the same way had received directions as to Paul. The latter, being restored to sight by Ananias, was introduced into the Church, in which, to the astonishment of all, he appeared as a teacher. This narrative entirely agrees with the way in which the apostle himself describes his conversion, as being effected suddenly by the Lord Himself through His appearance and inward enlightening. In full conformity with the custom of ancient historians, and because, perhaps, it seemed necessary to impress deeply the fact on its readers, the Acts of the Apostles makes Paul relate this event on two occasions. The differences in the narrative are easily reconciled. The apostle's companions saw no person, but perceived the light; and Paul alone heard the articulate voice, and what it said. And by all the other differences,—the account of the further visions (ch. xxii.), and the non-mention of Ananias (ch. xxvi.),—the essential character of the facts remains unaltered. The variations are, indeed, insignificant, and are readily explained by the intentional omission of some details, and the prominence given to others, just as the exigency of the moment suggested to the apostle. Thus, his intercourse with the legally pious Ananias, and his vision in the temple, are told to the people in Jerusalem (cf. 2 Cor. xii. 9). His call to the apostleship was simultaneous with his conversion; for, apart from his subsequent vision in the temple, he felt himself immediately provided with the gift of the apostolic spirit. This he was conscious of, as a gift of a knowledge

of Jesus as the Redeemer (Gal. i. and ii.), which was independent of other men, and based on the enlightenment and revelation of Christ. He felt it, too, to be the gift of an independent energy of efficiency for Christ's cause, complete in the power of Christ, and united with the outpouring of the Holy Spirit (1 Cor. xv. 10, cf. 9 ; 2 Cor. xii. ; cf. Gal. ii. 8 ; Eph. iii. 2-9). There was vouchsafed to him an independent conviction of the truth of Jesus' resurrection (1 Cor. xv.). On the one hand, he exalts the gift of the apostolic function as the first and highest among the gifts of the Spirit (1 Cor. xii. 28 ; Eph. iv. 11), and, on the other, he asserts the equality of *his* apostolic dignity with that of the other apostles ; indeed, he describes himself as one who had laboured more than all of them. We may gather from this the specific sense in which he ascribes to himself this office and its gifts. Thus, therefore, a new instrument had been prepared in the sphere of the Christian Church. Ere, however, we consider Paul's ministry, we must endeavour to get an insight into the course of development of his knowledge. It has been a subject of question whether the actual substance of his Christian knowledge, as it appears in his epistles, was attained by him gradually in the course of the struggle, or whether it was taught him by other Christians. We must negative both ideas. As regards the latter, the question would arise, whether, at the time of Paul's conversion, there were generally any Christians who had arrived at a clear perception of the actual point in the comprehension of the gospel to which the former had attained. The conversion of Cornelius, and of the Gentiles at Antioch, appears to have been a subsequent event. It is, too, very improbable that such unfettered ideas existed among any of the Christians at Damascus. That they were not generally current, is proved by the instances of Peter and the other apostles. There is no trace of Paul having come in contact with the men at Antioch. We find in him, besides, from the very first, a clear and developed consciousness of that which had been previously done in this respect without his co-operation, but, at the same time, done under extraordinary circumstances, and without any prevailing conviction. The principle exhibited itself in him with all the power of originality, and in a decisive course of action. His own testimony (Gal. i. and ii.) is conclusive on this point. His gospel, as he there calls it, is the expression of his own individual perception, being characteristic-

ally distinguished from the doctrinal type of the rest of the apostles, in that he regarded Christianity chiefly in its contrast to the Old Testament religion, and, in virtue of this contrast, asserted it to be a new way of salvation for all men. His own testimony, therefore, proves the originality of his standpoint. We are thus led on to the question, whether he himself only gradually framed his views; but he himself derives the individuality of his teaching from the revelation which, according to Gal. i. 16, was made to him at a certain time, clearly at the commencement of his conversion, at which time his peculiar views were certainly originated. Light had broken in upon him; but the connection of detailed points was a matter of gradual development, and, from the foundation laid, the whole scheme of doctrine grew out into organic life. This does not exclude the fact of other revelations (Gal. ii. 2; 2 Cor. xii. 1, cf. 7), all of which, however, bore some special import. The essential root of the matter was nevertheless planted at the first beginning.

All the points which might be supposed needful for such a sudden and thorough transformation existed in his character, and these were perfected by the mode of his conversion. One link of union may perhaps be found in his Hellenistic education; and the Alexandrine-Jewish theology might also have helped as a subordinate element. The main feature in Paul, his strict Pharisaism, developing as it did into red-hot fanaticism, must at all events put an end to certain rationalistic explanations as to the gradual effect of early impressions and the milder views derived from a Gamaliel; but yet, in this very Pharisaism, joined to the conscientiousness of his zeal and the force of his character, is found the great subjective force which explains so entire and sudden a transformation in his views and life. To this, however, must be added the objective impulse of the most potent agency employed in his conversion, when, being actually engaged in the work of persecution, he was at once convinced of the fact of the resurrection of Jesus, partly by a material and perceptible phenomenon, and partly by inward enlightening.

The peculiar course of his conversion and calling is, moreover, the prime mover in the special character of his ministry, and the principles which guided him in it. The sharper the line of distinction between his two states of mind,—the law, and faith in Jesus,—and the shorter the interval of time that divided them,

the more forcibly must the contrast between them have struck him. They stand opposed as night and day (2 Cor. iv. 6 ; Rom. xiii. 12 ; 1 Thess. v. 5), and were henceforth contrasted in his mind like death and life. To the rest of the apostles, too, Christianity seemed to be a new life, but yet distinguished only to a certain extent from their former views. But to Paul this distinction became a perfect contrariety. Thus was formed his conception of Christianity, which may be divided into two propositions: (1.) That salvation is to be found only in the gospel in Jesus Christ, and not in the law ; in faith alone, and not in works of the law—for Paul's condition under the law now seemed to him to be a state of darkness and death. He was, therefore, the more decided that the law, even at its best, could not avail to lead to righteousness in God's sight and to true life, much less to a knowledge of sin and its misery ; and that the very aim and signification of Christ and His redemption was that which the law could not satisfactorily effect. Compare the whole purport of the Epistles to the Galatians, Romans, and Philippians. The life, the depth of perception, and the fervour with which, in Rom. vii., Paul describes the whole position—the striving and wrestlings, and yet the impotence—of one under the law, warrant us in believing that he there gives his own personal experience ; and we are also shown how much the fundamental principle of his teaching was bound up with the actual nature of his conversion. (2.) The second proposition, connected with the first, is that all participation in the salvation in Christ is granted by grace, so that it is intended for the Gentiles no less than for the Jews. This was a simple conclusion from the former proposition, and must have been specially impressed upon the apostle's mind by his own experience. He had been a persecutor, and his own conversion must have been an evident proof to him of the undeserved grace of the God who called him, apart from any claim on his part (1 Tim. i. 13–16) ; therein was rooted his view of the complete freedom of this grace (1 Cor. i. 26–29 ; Tit. iii. 5 f. ; Rom. ix. 10). But this was also the groundwork of his view as to the calling of the Gentiles. To his mind, any idea of his pre-eminence over the Gentiles was psychologically impossible : all distinction between them disappeared in the strong feeling of man's common sinfulness (Rom. iii. 5 ; Gal. iii. 22). All that *Saul* the Pharisee had deemed to be high advantage and honour

was now as nothing in *Paul's* eyes (Phil. iii. 4-7). His whole view was based upon the consciousness afforded him in his conversion; and from this sprang his whole line of teaching as to sin and grace.

His actual ministry was in entire harmony with the peculiar principle of his way of looking at the gospel. He preached the gospel to the Gentiles, so that communities were formed of Gentile Christians, which were to be endowed with all the privileges of their Jewish brethren,—he himself, indeed, chiefly considering himself to be the apostle of the Gentiles. We are not able to follow out accurately the traces of his ministry during the earliest years after his conversion. According to the Epistle to the Galatians, he first abode in Arabia, and thence returning to Damascus, visited Jerusalem about three years after, where, however, he made but a short sojourn. The Acts of the Apostles omits the stay in Arabia, relating only that *after many days, ἡμέραι ἱκαναί* (Acts ix. 23), Paul was threatened in Damascus by the Jews (2 Cor. xi. 52), and that the journey to Jerusalem immediately followed. It has been thought strange, but incorrectly so, that the Acts of the Apostles is entirely silent as to the sojourn in Arabia. Looking at the decided and active character of Paul, it is certainly improbable that this interval was employed in mere meditation and the formation of his views. But he himself does not speak of any active ministry or its results. If, therefore, Luke was unacquainted with the details, he might very naturally in his brief narration include this period in the sojourn at Damascus; for his aim simply was to show, in the face of the Jewish enmity against Paul, that the latter did not separate himself from the ancient community with any hostile feelings. Paul, on the other hand, having a different end in view, might, by the mention of this sojourn and the interval of time it involves, bring prominently forward his independence of the other apostles. There is no unhistorical discrepancy between the Acts and the Epistle to the Galatians, in the fact that the former represents Paul as preaching the gospel not only to the Gentiles but to the Jews also, and, indeed, always to the Jews first; also that, when among heathen nations and in their cities, he always first visited the Jews' synagogue, and there first spoke to the Gentiles who might frequent it. Indeed, this line of conduct appears from his epistles to have been a principle with him; for

in his idea the gospel was intended for all men, but yet first and chiefly for the Jews, inasmuch as the latter possessed the promise, and by it were prepared for the gospel (cf. Rom. i. 16, and chs. ix., xi.). The Gentiles, as the wild twig, must be grafted on to the excellent olive-tree of the theocratic nation; and Israel's existing stubbornness does not do away with their original call. Thus, his words in Rom. xv. are in entire harmony with the fundamental ideas contained in the Epistle to the Romans. Besides, with respect to the relation to the law, he lays it down as his principle to be "all things to all men" (1 Cor. ix. 20 f.), in which, on the one hand, an accommodation to the Jewish customs is expressed, and, on the other, a free line of conduct in independence of the law. Both are contained in his two-sided view of the relation of the old covenant to the gospel; the latter being, on the one hand, identical with the former, on the other, something essentially new. If a stress be laid on one side only, not only may a contradiction result between the Acts and the Pauline epistles, but even between individual portions of the latter. But let both sides be comprehended together, as Paul himself laid them down, and they will be found to harmonize readily in his life, in his independence and brotherly relationship to the ancient community. In Jerusalem, Barnabas now commenced his intercourse with Paul; but the animosity of the Jews against the apostate allowing him no lengthened sojourn there, the brethren sent him by Cæsarea to Tarsus. Here, in his Cilician home, he doubtless founded Gentile churches (cf. Acts xv. 23, 41); for Barnabas appears to already know of him as a teacher of the Gentiles, as he fetches him thence to Antioch. Here, in the city which was now the metropolis of Gentile Christianity, that which Jerusalem had been during the earlier stages of development,—where, too, the Gentiles first applied the world-renowned name *Χριστιανοί* to those who had before called themselves *μαθητάς*, *ἀδελφούς*, or *πιστεύοντας*, but had received from the Jews the contemptuous designation of Nazarene,—here, in Antioch, Paul worked with Barnabas for a whole year, and henceforth becomes the hero of the history of the apostolical Church. He next undertook, with Barnabas, a journey (mentioned Acts xi. 30) to Jerusalem, to convey the contribution sent thither during the time of famine. After this one year's ministry follow his great mission-journeys into Gentile countries, three journeys being

enumerated. According to Acts xiii., Paul set out upon the first of these from Antioch in company with Barnabas and John Mark (who, however, returned to Jerusalem from Pamphylia). They journeyed through Seleucia, Cyprus, Paphos, Antioch in Pisidia, Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe; thence through Lystra, etc., back to Antioch, where he again remained quiet some time (?). In the meantime, the important controversies arose which led him to Jerusalem (Acts xv.), whence with Silas and Judas he again returned to Antioch. Soon after (ch. xv. 36), he started thence on his second long journey with Silas to Lystra, and, with Timothy accompanying him, to Troas, when Luke also appears to have travelled with him, and so on to Europe, through Samothracia to Philippi and Thessalonica. Paul's companions remaining here, he went on to Athens and Corinth, whence, after a year and a half's sojourn, he again returned through Ephesus and Syria to Jerusalem. Not long after, he commenced his third great mission-journey to Galatia, Phrygia, and Ephesus. At the latter place, where he remained two years, he wrote his first Epistle to the Corinthians. He then travelled into Macedonia and Greece, where he abode three months, and then through Macedonia and Philippi to Troas, Mitylene, Tyre, and Jerusalem at the time of the feast. In Jerusalem he was made a prisoner, and was detained for two years at Cæsarea, and afterwards at Rome, at least for a length of time sufficient to realize the wish he had expressed in his Epistle to the Romans in reference to the Church there. At this point his history in the Acts of the Apostles comes to a close.

Paul's ministry was thus the means of establishing Christianity in Syria and Asia Minor, in Greece, and as far as Illyria,—indeed, in the world-renowned city of Rome itself. And it was so established that, especially in the cities, the centres of intercourse for a whole province, mother churches were founded. But yet all this was only the external aspect of his vocation. Whilst the gospel was being carried to the Gentiles, his efforts tended to maintain the inward unity of the Church,—the living bond of union between the Gentile and Jewish communities,—so that no irreconcilable opposition should be established between them, but that Christianity should be developed in all its peculiarity and unity. In this, too, Paul took the lead of all the others, although he had the most distinguished of the apostles as his fellow-

workers. It was pre-eminently his great task to bring together the universal and historical character of Christianity in a living unity. For this the chief requisite was that the metropolis of Gentile Christianity, which was forming in Antioch, should be placed in connection with the mother Church at Jerusalem. Paul assisted in this object, by promoting the contributions of the Gentile Christians to the poor brethren in Jerusalem (Acts xi. 27), —a measure which he subsequently treated as a regular practice (Gal. ii. 10; 1 Cor. xvi. 1 ff.; 2 Cor. viii., and ix. 12). This was not only a question of outward support, but also of a linking together of the churches, and of a fellowship in faith. The great contrariety in religious views, which was now developed, is noticed in the Pauline epistles, especially that to the Galatians; and the author of the Acts of the Apostles, however much his aim was to represent the unity of Pauline and Jewish Christianity, in no way blinks the fact. On the contrary, he shows how, in Antioch, under the influence of the Church of Jerusalem, this contrariety broke out into open controversy, so that it was to be feared that, between the two churches, something like hostility might arise. The important fact that the originators of the Gentile Church at Antioch came from Jerusalem, constituted an indissoluble bond of union, which was of essential support to Paul. But the more strictly disposed Jewish Christians at Jerusalem had merely acknowledged this Church as a fact, and were, indeed, only led by facts to this bare acknowledgment. They now saw this *fact* growing up into gigantic proportions, and yet their inward scruples were not overcome nor even silenced, and they were compelled to fear that they should see the old mother Church surpassed by this Gentile community. A reaction then necessarily set in, which was headed by zealots, some of whom were vehement and some anxious as to the result. The fit moment seemed to have arrived for coming to a thorough understanding, and thus obviating any schism. Events now followed in quick succession. Certain Christians came from Judea to Antioch, and required that the Gentile Christians should be circumcised, as a condition of salvation (Acts xv. 1). These were men who had been Pharisees, and now, as Christians, desired to retain all the Pharisaical principles as to the law. Paul and Barnabas most decidedly opposed these views. Nothing of the kind had been hitherto expected from the Gentiles; and now the requisition did not proceed either

from the apostles themselves, or from the mass of Jewish Christians generally, but from a certain extreme party among them. This entirely agrees with the designation which Paul applies to these people (Gal. ii. 4, *διὰ τοὺς παρεισάκτους ψευδαδέλφους*); and all that he says in this passage is in full harmony with the Acts of the Apostles. But the matter in question, now that it was openly brought forward, needed a thorough settlement, so that the pillars of the Church, acknowledged as such on both sides, might come to an understanding with Paul and Barnabas as to the negation of this Pharisaico-Christian principle. It was therefore resolved in Antioch to send delegates to Jerusalem with this end in view. This conclusion may have been mainly brought about by Paul's *ἀποκάλυψις* (mentioned Gal. ii.), and the consequent modification of his opinions. Of that which took place in Jerusalem we have a double account, in Acts xv. 6-29 and Gal. ii. 1-10; for it may be assumed as settled that Paul's two journeys to Jerusalem are identical. Whether the fourteen years be reckoned from his first visit to Jerusalem or from the date of his conversion, in either case he had exercised his Gentile apostleship more than ten years when this question arose. According to the Acts, after Paul and his companions had met with a kindly reception from the apostles who were there, and the elders of the Church, there first ensued a communication on the part of the delegates as to the great things God had wrought by them. But even at this first meeting (Acts xv. 4), which was distinct from the subsequent public assembly, and was of a more private character, certain Pharisaical Christians expressed the same opinions which had been propounded in Antioch. This led to the calling of a formal public assembly of the heads of the Church (ver. 6, *οἱ ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι συνήχθησαν*). The historian does not conceal from us that this meeting from the first was a stormy one, and contrary opinions were rudely opposed to one another. But Peter's speech was of a conciliatory character, and first of all led the zealots to feel that it was through the dispensation of God, as they indeed knew, that the gospel had proved so effectual to the Gentiles and that the latter had become believers, the testimony of the gift of the Holy Spirit confirming God's will as to their acceptance. He reverted also to the standpoint which the Church at Jerusalem had taken with regard to the conversion of the Gentiles, even before the agency of the Apostle Paul. This had,

at all events, the effect of tranquillizing and enlightening the confusion of the controversy, so that the historical account given by Paul and Barnabas was calmly listened to. The decision itself was brought on by James, who in all points enjoyed the highest authority among the Jewish Christian party (Gal. ii. 12), on account of his living in strict conformity to the law. He, naming Peter by his Hebrew name *Simcon*, in the first place pointed to the prophecies of the old covenant, which speak of the adoption of the Gentiles into the theocracy; but, for the decision of the matter itself, makes a conciliatory proposal, that the fulfilment of the statutory law of the Old Testament should not be imposed upon the Jewish Christians, and that salvation should not be made dependent on this, but on the grace of God in Christ, and faith in Him alone. But in order to facilitate the fellowship of the Jewish and Gentile Christians in daily life, the latter must take a step to meet the former. It was difficult for the Jews to look upon a Gentile as pure, and especially a Gentile Christian, unless he renounced everything which belonged to or even called to mind the worship of idols, as both Gentiles and Jews were very apt to bring along with them into Christianity much that was connected with their former life. The Gentile Christians were therefore to keep the so-called Noachian commandments, which, indeed, were considered to be addressed to all nations, and to abstain from pollutions of idols, things strangled, and blood, and also from *πορνεία*. It has seemed rather a difficult question how the latter point comes to be mentioned in this connection. But it must be understood here as referring to customs which had become established among heathen nations; so that, on going over to Christianity, the full idea of chastity was not entertained, as, for thousands of years, this sensual pleasure had been looked upon not merely as an *adiaphoron*, but even as something praiseworthy, and to a certain extent connected with worship. The Jewish law had a far higher idea of chastity, which, however, did not attain to the dignity and purity of the Christian view. In any case, the matter in question here was a certain participation in idolatrous worship, and the customs connected therewith. This proposal was no doubt a very wise one. It held fast to the principles of the gospel, and, without burdening the conscience, facilitated the outward fellowship between the two parties, thus opening out the way for their inward blending. Paul, too, need feel no scruple

in accepting the proposition; for the *πορνεία* was of course entirely opposed to the Christian standpoint, and the other matters were no real hindrance to the Gentile Christians. He himself looked upon it as a bounden duty to show every indulgence to his weaker fellow-Christians (Rom. xiv. 13; 1 Cor. x. 23 ff.); and as to eating of meat offered to idols, he expresses himself very decisively (1 Cor. viii. and x.).

After this proposal was resolved upon, a letter to the same effect was written to the Church of Antioch; and the whole community rejoiced at this solution of the matter. Paul's account in the Epistle to the Galatians is in entire harmony with this narrative. He, indeed, does not mention the public assembly and consultation, but he relates how he and Barnabas came to Jerusalem about this question, and that there the fundamental truth of his persuasion of the gospel was not attacked, but that, on the contrary, the chief apostles gave to them the right hand of fellowship; also, that circumcision and the observance of the Mosaic law was not required from the Gentile Christians; and that his call to be an apostle to the Gentiles was recognised as a settled matter in full brotherly union. The fact of Paul's being attacked by false brethren, and nevertheless acknowledged by the most distinguished apostles, was, as regarded his teaching, the most striking confirmation of his apostolic independence. This, therefore, was what he had to lay the stress upon in *his* account; and in the epistle might naturally content himself with stating no more than bore upon the relation which was brought about in his private negotiation with the apostles, and the result of it, which followed in the public assembly. Luke, on the other hand, was bound to narrate the convention of the apostles, and, as an historian, to give an accurate account of the course of development of the Church generally. And although he does not touch upon the promise of contributions for the poor Jewish Christians (Gal. ii. 10), still in other places he makes quite sufficient mention of this part of Paul's ministry. Neither does the subsequent conduct of Peter at Antioch (Gal. ii. 11) at all militate with the way in which he is made to appear on this occasion by the Acts of the Apostles. For although he does not appear there to have acted according to his former principles, still Paul clearly enough expresses that it was not because he held a different opinion. On the contrary, his conduct seems to have been an accommoda-

tion of principle to the strict Jews, which Paul characterizes by the strong terms *ὑποστέλλειν* and *ὑπόκρισις*, as being in opposition to Peter's own convictions,—a line of conduct in which he must have perceived the great injustice he was committing against the Gentile Christians and the truth of the gospel itself, which, too, was all the more dangerous, as by his example others, as Barnabas, were led away. In Paul's address to Peter (Gal. ii. 14–16), he evidently treats the latter as one who had previously held different views; and on this account Peter could not answer him.

But, notwithstanding the apostles' decree, and its acceptance at Antioch, and also the fact that Paul on every occasion exhorted to this course of action (Acts xvi. 4; Rom. xiv.; 1 Cor. viii. and x.), the contest assuredly was not yet concluded. Thus, indeed, it is represented in the Acts of the Apostles. When Paul, years after, again came to Jerusalem (Acts xxi.), we see how great the division still was between the Gentile and Jewish Christians. It was not now desired that the former should observe the law; but the question had reached a new stage, and the Jewish Christians thought that Paul outwardly taught the latter that they were no longer to keep it. This, however, was insufferable to them; for the law, to the Jews of that time, still continued a matter of conscience; and, consequently, the excitement was still great in the Jewish community. The reaction would be all the more likely to break out again; because, looking at the great increase of the Church, even among the Jews (Acts xxi. 20), there were certainly many only superficially affected by Christianity, who had only outwardly changed the hope of the expected Messiah for faith in the Messiahship of Jesus, and therefore might readily be led away by the spirit of Pharisaical zeal. But even in the churches which Paul himself founded he must have seen that the same seed was sown; indeed, in the Galatian Church, the reaction of these *κακοὶ ἐργάται* was enabled to make head so powerfully, that they also desired that the Gentile Christians should be circumcised. In Corinth, too, his apostolical authority was attacked on this point, and he was compelled to vindicate it in his epistles. In Rome itself, he had to oppose the view that salvation resulted from the righteousness of the law. The same appearances are evident at Philippi. The Jewish Christians were certain to be again stirred up, so long as they lived together amid the holy

places with the Jews themselves, who looked upon Paul as a blasphemer of the law. Only the destruction of the city and the doing away of the temple could overcome this opposition. And yet, through all this, Paul did not waver, either in his great principles of gospel freedom, or in the noble mildness and amicable toleration of his conduct, condescending to their weakness whenever it was possible (Acts xxi. 26). Like a rock in a tempest, he stood amid the fermenting elements, certain of his victory.

Thus far we are led by the records of the New Testament history of the apostolical period. In the rest of the literature of the New Testament, especially the writings of John, we get but a glimpse of a fourth stage of development in the Christian community. But it is certain that we are thereby transferred to a standpoint, in which the contest appears to have ceased, and the opposition between the Jewish and Gentile Christians to have been obviated. We here find the fact acknowledged as an undisputed certainty, that the law only came by Moses, and that grace and truth came by Jesus Christ; that the old covenant was, indeed, a divine preparation, but that Christianity was something essentially new. As the Epistle to the Hebrews so constantly refers to the Old Testament form of worship, we might have expected to find some hint that all this worship had come to an end. The fact that no such hint exists has been made use of to prove that this epistle was composed before the destruction of Jerusalem. But the fact of this event having preceded, may just as well have suggested to the author to show that, although the law and its substance no longer existed, they were nevertheless fulfilled in Christianity. Among the *Antilegomena* of the New Testament, the second Epistle of St. Peter must, in all critical probability, be placed in this later period; and in it, too, we find the reconciliation of this opposition presupposed as a matter of fact, and, indeed, expressly mentioned (2 Pet. iii. 15 f.). If we add to these considerations, that the tragical issue of the second Jewish war under Hadrian, which destroyed the remnant of the Jewish nation, must have also tended to depress the Jewish element in the Christian Church, we shall completely make good the idea that the Christian community became more and more independent of the Jewish nationality.

III.—THE COMMENCEMENT OF OUTWARD ACTION IN THE APOSTOLIC COMMUNITY.

§ 50. *The Conflict of the Apostolic Church with the World.*

The essence of Judaism consisted in a one-sided absorption in the law; and therefore it chiefly exhibited itself, on the one hand, in the haughty, self-righteous limitation of God's grace to the Jewish people to the exclusion of all other nations, and, on the other hand, in a slavish clinging to the letter of the law, and a steadfast adherence to all its legal statutes. And now, in direct opposition to all this, Christianity presented itself as a life common to all, which depended upon Christ as a freer and more living Spirit, designed for all people and all times. In the spirit of Christianity the divine as well as the human part of the old covenant was acknowledged, for that spirit asserted itself as the fulfilment of the law and the prophets, in conformity with the example of Jesus Himself. How severe a conflict the Christian community had, on this account, to wage against the reaction of Judaism, the steps of their development, and, still more, the ministry of the Apostle Paul, have already shown. If we look still deeper into the elements with which Christianity had to contend, we shall find the practical Judaistic school must be separated from those of a more contemplative and theosophic kind. The practical school maintains itself on its summit of Pharisaism, and declares itself in the demand that the Gentile Christians should be circumcised, and should fulfil the Mosaic laws. This demand was not complied with; but this very failure, and the fact of the ministry of Paul making so powerful an impression on the heathen, provoked those zealots yet more, as we have already seen in the Galatian transactions, it being there shown that they even led away the Gentile Christians with them in their delusion. Those in Corinth appear to have acted more liberally. There the Judaistic part of the community divided itself into two parties, *οἱ τοῦ Κηφᾶ* and *οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ*,—which last boasted, as it appears, of a closer and more direct union with the Lord. This was perhaps on account of their holding to James. The chief thing we know about them is only their indirect opposition to the Pauline principles, through their disputing the apostolic authority of Paul, as compared, at least,

with that of the older apostles. They must have acted similarly at Philippi, where the apostle contrasted with them his own Jewish pretensions (iii. 2 ff.); at the same time he there had reason to attack their moral character. Such men had crept in, too, at Rome, according to Rom. xvi. 17-20, where the stock of the community, without doubt, were Jewish Christians, and mildly Judaistic in character. We cannot conclude from the contents of the Epistle to the Romans that circumcision was no longer a matter in question, or go so far as to say it is not even mentioned (cf. ch. iv.). Neither can we conclude from chs. ix.-xi. that the Judaistic party had here generally set themselves against all conversions from the Gentiles. These chapters are easily interpreted, if we look upon the apostle as merely obviating the Judaistic scruples that, owing to the actual non-acceptance of the gospel by so many of the Jews, the Old Testament promises to the people were not fulfilled,—which amounted to a doubt as to the Messianic character of the gospel. But certainly the Epistle to the Romans exhibits a peculiar modification of the practical Judaistic school in ch. xiv., where the apostle distinguishes between the weak and the strong in the community, and points those out as the weak who make distinctions in their food, only eating vegetables, and even abstaining from wine (ver. 21). In the same way also they held to the setting apart of days. James already represented an ascetico-Judaistic school in Jerusalem. This school might assert itself with feeble timidity within the limits of Christianity; but it might also combine with a theosophical and more universal view, so that we find it very clearly distinguished from the merely practical Judaism opposed by St. Paul in Col. ii. 16 f. These Judaists were indeed ascetic, but not merely in the legal sense. They shared more in the spirit of the Essenes, but at the same time they displayed a superstitious reverence for superior spirits, which leads to a connection with that theosophy pervading the East, of which Essenism itself was only an offspring. All these forms of Jewish teaching, Christianity had to overcome. In this process of enlightenment, all that remained of the Old Testament was the ethical monotheism in the form of the divine manifestation, and the reference to an historical and preparative development.

But the spirit of the heathen world also opposed Christianity.

The essence of heathenism was an absorption in nature, mingled partly with a materialistic unbelief and superstition, and partly with a blunted morality and a self-chosen worship. This unbelief had gradually given way to the necessity of Theism, but with it there arose at the same time a materialistic superstition; whilst the need felt of some elevation above mere nature had led to an ever-extending system of magic, which, arising chiefly in the East, especially in Chaldea and Egypt, found its way even into the very centre of the Roman empire. This heathen magic, also, Christianity now encountered on its course of extension, and had to overcome. Of this conflict, implied as it is in the nature of the case, the apostolic history gives us examples—that of the magician Simon (Acts viii. 9–11); that of Elymas (ch. xiii. 8–13); and, further, in ch. xix. 19 f. Magic had also mingled itself with Judaism generally, as Josephus relates, in the form of exorcism, and also in other shapes. The *γόητες* in 2 Tim. iii. 13 can only be regarded as deceivers generally, but, from the context, they are without doubt deceivers in this specific signification. How, on the other hand, idolatry and deep immorality were connected with this heathen materialism, Paul himself has shown (Rom. i., cf. 1 Cor. vi. 9–11; Eph. iv. 17–19). Even where Christianity had taken root in heathen life, these immoralities were sure always to be appearing at least in the form of temptations, though not invincible temptations. If, also, in heathen territory a custom of any evil nature had become firmly established, Christianity was not, at least at its commencement, in a position at once to overturn the whole custom, especially as the converted heathen still continued to live in a state of relation to the unconverted, and convenience still exercised great power over them. The apostles themselves did not even require that the Christians should cut themselves off from social intercourse with unbelievers; for Paul supposes the case of their being invited by them to idolatrous feasts, as well as to other meals, to which, in general, he raises no objection (1 Cor. x. 27 ff.). But it now can easily be understood how the apostles had sometimes to fight against the remnants of heathen usages, as is shown by the grievous lapses dealt with in 1 Cor. v., vi., and the mention of *πορνεία* (Acts xv. 20), and by the general and special admonitions (Eph. iv. 17 ff., v. 3 ff.; Rom. xiii. 11 ff.; 1 Cor. x. 14 ff.; 1 Thess. iv. 4 ff.; 1 Pet. iv. 1 ff.). We see the tendency to fall

back into heathen libertinism especially attacked in the first Epistle of John, ch. iii., cf. v. 21, in the second Epistle of Peter, in the Epistle of Jude, and in the Revelation of St. John ii. 14 f., xx. 3, 4. Antinomian tendencies could, by misrepresenting it, link themselves on to the Pauline idealism. And as the Judaistic zeal affected here and there even Gentile Christians, so reversely we see converted Jewish zealots tainted with this libertinism (cf. Phil. iii. 18 f.; Rom. xvi. 18; Tit. i. 10-16). In other respects, perhaps, Hellenism and heathenism presented to Christianity some important points on which it would lay hold, not only because the necessity of belief in a living world-creating God had been awakened even among them, but also because the very universality of the gospel, meeting the progress of Hellenic civilisation, and of the national spirit of Rome, made that true in a higher sense which religious syncretism was already striving after. But Christianity still had before it the gigantic task of overcoming the spirit of the old times, and, through the free and living Spirit from God, establishing a new world-transforming principle. It is therefore easily seen how, at all times, but most especially when it drew new nations into its sphere, it had a tremendous conflict to undergo in that ferment, out of which the heterogeneous elements of spiritual life were to be gradually separated.

§ 51. *The Constitutional Form of the Apostolic Church.*

In the fulfilment of its great task, it was necessary to the Christian community to mould itself into an organic unity by appropriate outward forms. It is not our aim here to investigate fully the history of the constitutional form of the Christian society as we find it in the New Testament, and must limit ourselves to pointing out the principal features of the development. Christianity, like every powerful society, spontaneously evolved the forms of its arrangements, at the same time making use of what historically preceded it. And in the latter point it gave the preference to the system of synagogue-teaching, as the most appropriate basis of an organism with a mutual religious aim, and for the purpose of divine worship. But while, on one hand, it now moulded itself into established forms and prescribed functions, seasons, and duties, yet in no way was the free scope of the spirit of Christianity lost through these dispositions. We have to dis-

tinguish two steps in the history of this development. We meet with the first at the time of the foundation of the community at Jerusalem, and the second at the commencement of its foreign extension. The happy foundation of the Christian community was owing to the fact, that Christianity could at once attain to a high point of confederate organization, finding as it did the necessary period of tranquillity. It may almost be said to have been organized, from the very commencement, by the Lord Himself marking out the twelve as His apostles from the number of the disciples whom He had instructed. Around these the community gathered itself. They were its natural heads; and when the foreign operations began, their number was sufficient to allow of enough being left at home for the work at Jerusalem. In these earliest times, we find united worship to be the first want and the first tie of the community (Acts ii. 42, 46, 47); and, besides, their life was in many ways passed in fellowship,—in common meals, for instance, combined with the breaking of bread. Indeed, the society was one in outward appearance so closely united, that at the first glance it appears to be represented as possessing absolute community of property. But we may conclude from the story of Ananias and Sapphira, and particularly from the expressions Peter uses in accusing them, that it was only a mutual alliance for coming forward to help all the needy. In spirit they acknowledged all things as common to all (iv. 32), but in practice they always adhered to the individual donation of very noble, but partial and entirely free-will offerings. We see this corroborated in the aim of the diaconate, and in certain signs which we may observe in the subsequent period, as in ch. xii. 12, where a house is mentioned as being the private property of the mother of Mark, which, however, she allowed the community to use for their common needs. At the same time, we see the first beginnings of increasing distinctions in the life of the community, which founded themselves on a natural and customary basis. The *νεώτεροι, νεανίσκοι* (Acts v. 6–10), rendered service amongst them in outward things. Soon after this, as the community grew, there arose a need for more fixed regulations. The care of the poor, to which the apostles, occupied as they were with the ministry, could no longer devote themselves, required persons appointed expressly for it; so they chose the deacons for this office (Acts vi.). As the Spirit created the community, the

outward needs led to further outward organization, but always with the retention of the spirit of Christian liberty. The apostles were, and always remained, the heads of the community, appointed by the Lord Himself; but nevertheless the Christians, by their further organization, were not shut out from spontaneous action. We see this in the election of the deacons (Acts vi. 2, 3); and even in the completion of the apostolic circle (ch. i. 12–26) the rest of the community took their part. A second step in the formation of the outer life of the Church arises with the further spread of Christianity. Besides the deacons, male and female, we now find *πρεσβύτεροι* gradually set up, overseers of the community, who were more and more needed, as the apostles, by the multiplying and distance of the churches, were less able to fulfil these duties alone. We have no account of the origin of this office, but it must have grown out of the need for it at a very early time, and, doubtless, followed the form of synagogue rule. The apostles, as the heads appointed by the Lord Himself, ordained teachers and overseers wherever they had founded a church, and in that way provided for its continuance. The *πρεσβύτεροι* are also called *ἐπίσκοποι*; and we find no trace in the New Testament of a difference being at that time made between them, or that the *ἐπίσκοποι* had become heads over the *πρεσβύτεροι*.

But there was always combined with these fixed forms free spiritual action, as we may particularly notice in the Apostle Paul's expressions as to spiritual gifts (1 Cor. xii, xiv.). The apostles remained undisputedly the first, but, alongside with them, the gifts of the Spirit were allowed to work freely in the community (1 Cor. xii. 23–31). First of all, there were the gifts of the word in a twofold form, in the instruction of the *διδάσκαλοι*, and the direct outpouring of inspiration from the *προφήται*, to whose working that more individual and self-edifying utterance the *γλώσσαις λαλεῖν* is allied. The speakers with tongues were not false teachers (cf. 1 Cor. xiv. 18); but disorders occurred in the speaking with tongues, connected with the confusion of parties, against which the apostle speaks. These gifts came into exercise in the assembly for divine worship, where not only one, but many in succession, spoke. There were other gifts besides, which belonged to the outward direction of the community (1 Cor. xii. 28), the *κυβερνήσεις*, the *ἀντιλήψεις*, as ministers to the poor, nurses to the sick; and gifts of extraordinary capability to

remedy the evils of common life, the *δυνάμεις*, especially the *χαρίσματα ἰαμάτων*,—all had reference to the life of unity which they led, and were to be carried out in love. It was the task of Christian wisdom to take care that each of these sides, the established administration, and the free spiritual action, should maintain its due right; and we see in the apostolic time that both grew together in proportion with the living spirit of the Church. Later, we see them gradually separate. Established forms exhibited themselves more and more strongly, until at last a whole system of hierarchy was founded. On the other hand, freedom of spirit, in its one-sidedness, diverged into Montanism, in which they set value only on direct gifts. But the apostolic time is characterized by this harmonious concord as the earliest stage of the development.

SECOND DIVISION.

THE TEACHING OF THE APOSTLES.

§ 52. *The Apostolic Teaching in general, considered in its Unity—its Unity in Character and Source.*

WE must regard the apostolic teaching as a teaching which has life in itself. The apostles and apostolic teachers include themselves in a participation in the new life in Christ, and teach, as their whole testimony shows, as those who stand established themselves in the living truth. Only in this way can the New Testament teaching be rightly comprehended. The full proof of this must be in the whole statement of their doctrine. But, even from a single preliminary reference, we may find, in a writing where the Christian doctrines are very little unfolded, how the author considers himself, and all who have a share with him in Christianity, as those who are spiritually begotten of God through the word of truth (Jas. i. 18),—through that same word of truth which he proclaims, and which (ver. 21) should be received without opposition, “in meekness, as the ingrafted word which is able to save their souls.” To him also who inwardly receives the truth here taught, his soul being thereby made free, it becomes a source of life in him, springing from God Himself. This same principle is common to all the apostolic writings (cf. 1 Pet. i. 3, 23, 25; 1 John i. 3; 1 Cor. ix. 27). On this account the doctrine of these writings is not communicated as the individual self-made doctrine of the apostles and apostolic writers, still less as extraneous teaching derived from without, or an aggregate of heterogeneous matter. But the Christian life, as marked out in the doctrine, is from God; so that the doctrine itself is also the word of God, the power through which God calls this new life into existence (Jas. i. 18), the power of God unto redemption and unto salvation (Rom. i. 16; Jas. i. 21). The apostles, in communicating this word, communicate it as that which has

already confirmed in *them* this life-giving and emancipating power, and give the strong and living testimony of their own experience "in demonstration of the Spirit and of power" (1 Cor. ii. 4 ; Heb. ii. 3, 4). Thus the setting forth of Christian truth in these New Testament writings so shapes itself that, though testimony is given of the truth of that which is promulgated, the real convincing power of the demonstration rests on harmony, presupposed and sometimes intimated, between it and the experience of the reader, so that the true demonstration of the Spirit and of power is limited,—that is, it comes only to those readers who are being led in the life-giving way of Christian truth.

The apostolic doctrine has, according to the New Testament writings, a common origin. In the first place, one which is historical,—the apostles' experimental knowledge of the appearance and teaching of Jesus Christ. What the apostles taught in their vocation is directly derived from that which Jesus Himself taught ; but His personality and His history, as far as they were witnesses of it, were no less rich sources of knowledge for them. Their intercourse with the Lord Himself in various circumstances, and also the principal facts of His history, were as much calculated as His word to afford them light on that which must be the main subject of their teaching—the person and the work of Jesus Christ. But all He said to them on these points took very little hold of them before they had been witnesses of His whole history, until He was taken out of their sight. That which they witnessed was the moral school through which they were brought to a right comprehension of the person and work of Christ ; and therein lay their preparation for those special gifts of the Spirit which came upon them after the Lord's ascension. We see in the apostolic teaching that a reference to the personal appearance and to the words of the Lord was essential to the apostles (John i. 16, 18 ; 1 John i. 1–3). They regarded themselves as witnesses of Christ, of His life and of His sufferings (1 Pet. v. 1 ; Heb. i. 1, ii. 3). When the word of truth is glorified as the divine regenerator and deliverer (Jas. i. 18, 21), that which was spoken by Christ Himself is necessarily understood to form a part of it, and, indeed, regarded as the substance of the whole. It is true that one of the apostolic writers,—one, indeed, who stands pre-eminently the first in the copiousness of his teaching,—was not a personal disciple of Jesus ; but he also refers con-

startly to the historically attested bodily presence of Jesus Christ, and appeals to the historical events of the Lord's life as much from the experimental knowledge which fell to his share (1 Cor. xv. 8, cf. 11, ix. 1) as from the historical testimony of others, which was at his command, and was set forth by him with the greatest care (1 Cor. xv. 3-7).

But when the apostles allow us a glimpse into the source of their knowledge, we find that they do not confine themselves to their experimental acquaintance with the person and teaching of Jesus, but that they also appeal to that Spirit of Christ promised them in the farewell discourses recorded by John (xiv.-xvii.), and subsequently imparted (Acts ii.) to them; in which Spirit they claim to have the direct well-spring of their teaching, and their warrant and authority for it. That this second inner source of knowledge is to be placed by the side of the historical, is expressly declared by Peter in the sermon on the day of Pentecost (Acts ii., also in 1 Pet. i. 12); and the same shows itself if we compare 1 John i. 1 ff. with ii. 27; and we find the greatest stress laid on it by St. Paul (1 Cor. ii.). Here he declares part of the purport of his doctrine to be divine wisdom,—the decree of redemption which God ordained before the world and accomplished in due time, which man's wisdom could not have devised (vers. 7, 9). The other part, the setting forth of this inner meaning, was spoken by him in words, he tells us, not those which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth, as supereminently spiritual, coming from God, and only to be estimated and comprehended through the influence of the Holy Ghost (vers. 13-16). Paul lays all the more stress on this calling, the Spirit of Jesus Christ being pre-eminently to *him* the Spirit of revelation, through his not having passed through the apostolic school. He declares, therefore, most emphatically, that he received the gospel which he preached neither from man nor through man (Gal. i. 11, 12), but that God had revealed His Son to him in his soul when He called him out of darkness into light (2 Cor. iv. 6).

No one can rightly comprehend the apostolic teaching who does not regard it in this light, and recognise each and every apostolic doctrine as issuing from this standpoint of spiritual, not human, invention and accomplishment.

§ 53. *The Apostolical Teaching in general, considered in its Unity—Its Unity in Purport.*

The unity of the apostolic doctrine is owing to this, that the teaching of all the apostles, as far as it is historically declared to us in the New Testament, has for its common subject the divine salvation and life in Jesus Christ; and therefore treats, (1) of the person of Jesus Christ as the Lord; (2) of the salvation and life of which He is the Author, contrasted with the destruction brought by sin into the world; and hence (*a*) of the fulfilment of the old covenant contained in this salvation; (*b*) of participation in the same by faith in Jesus Christ through a new birth from God; (*c*) of the fellowship of this faith in love; (*d*) of the completion of this salvation through the final revelation of Jesus Christ.

The structure of this teaching rests on the broad and deep foundation of the religious outlook upon the world, which is found already rooted in the writings of the Old Testament, and, in its New Testament potency and realization, spreads itself over the whole surface of the New Testament writings. And therein lies the essential harmony of the apostolic teaching with that of Jesus, notwithstanding a noticeable difference between them, caused by the advancing development of the work of Christ, and the variety in their subject, purpose, and circumstances. If we examine the drift of those writings of St. Paul and St. John in which their teaching is most developed, we shall find St. John's principal subject is *life in Jesus Christ*; on the one side (objectively), that Christ is *the Life* (1 John i. 1 ff.), on the other (subjectively), that man's life consists in fellowship with Christ (1 John v. 12). This life stands in contrast to the death which is the portion of those men who, being out of Christ, have their fellowship with the world (iii. 14, v. 4). The same groundwork of thought runs also through the Pauline writings, only that there, so far as it is taken subjectively, life is very often expressed by the negative terms salvation (*σωτηρία*) or redemption (Rom. i. 16, x. 10, 13; 1 Cor. i. 21). Peter also speaks of a *σωτηρία* as the goal of faith, although now already, through a living hope, life in a new form and after a new standard belongs to the Christian (1 Pet. i. 3-12). We find the same idea in Jas. i. 21, 25, ii. 14. Therefore, according to all these apostolic writings, Christianity is the religion of salvation through Jesus Christ. Thus these

writings treat of the person of Christ as of the Lord, the Author of salvation, on whom man depends for it. This is declared often *ex professo*, and often it comes in casually; and, even when the real subject of the teaching is rather salvation and life in themselves, the person of Jesus Christ is at least briefly recognised as that of the Lord. Thus we find in the Epistle of James, "our Lord" (i. 1), "the Lord of glory" (ii. 1), who cometh as Judge (v. 7-9). If this only amounts to a minimum of Christology (with which the Epistle of Jude may be compared, who in ver. 4 refers to Jesus Christ, the only Lord God, and our Lord), we find this subject more richly unfolded by Peter, by Paul, by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and by John.

Sometimes the doctrine of salvation and life in themselves may be very amply handled in comparison with the doctrine of the person of Christ, and *vice versâ*; yet, owing to the practical tendency of the New Testament writings, where the first point is the one most dilated upon, the second cannot be dismissed so briefly as the first point is in the Epistles of James and Jude. Questions on the foundation and nature of salvation are ever closely connected; therefore Acts iv. 11, 12, may be considered the theme of the apostolic teaching. In studying this, four points come out prominently.

Firstly, what the apostles had to announce has reference to a foregone divine economy under the old covenant; and it was not going out of the way to put the apostolic *κήρυγμα* in relation with this old covenant. This relation is pointed out in the fact that the salvation and life established in Christ are the fulfilment of the old covenant. Therein is included both the inner union of the gospel with the old covenant, and also the superiority of the new covenant over the old, so that the new gives more than the old,—the *ὑπόστασις τῶν πραγμάτων*, not only the *σκιά* (Heb. xi. 1, cf. x. 1). Notwithstanding his slight development of doctrine, James brings forward the connection between Christianity and the Old Testament. Christianity, as the word of truth which is planted in us, is called *νόμος τέλειος ὁ τῆς ἐλευθερίας* (i. 25, cf. i. 18-21), or simply *νόμος ἐλευθερίας* (ii. 12). As the old covenant is a law, so also is the new; but the latter does not appear only as a higher form of the old, but as something which did not exist before, for the old covenant was not a law of liberty. Though he may have appealed to the Old Testament

when he describes love as the royal law (ii. 8, 11, 12), and may show a predilection for Old Testament deeds and persons, yet he recognised as inseparable both sides of the relation between the two Testaments, just as the James of the Acts of the Apostles refers to the prophets in order to prove what is permitted under the new covenant (Acts xv. 15). We find the same thing in the more developed statements of Peter, not only in his earliest apostolical discourses, in which, before the Jews, he was compelled to give his preaching a certain relation to the Old Testament, and specially to represent it as a fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy, but also in the doctrinal statement which is given in 1 Pet. i. 10-12, ii. 5-10. That which the apostles preach is the fulfilment of prophecy, and all that the people of God were in the Old Testament—the house of God and the chosen race—is and will be, in the full sense of the word, realized in Christians (cf. 2 Pet. i. 19 ff.). No one can doubt that the more developed doctrinal systems teach that the gospel surpassed the old covenant (John i. 17; 1 John i. 2; Gal. ii. 21, iii. 21; 2 Cor. iii.). Also the later Pauline and the pastoral epistles express the same idea (Eph. ii. 18; Col. ii. 16 f.; Tit. i. 2). But however decidedly this side of the question is set forth, no less so do we also find the assertion of a real connection between the two forms of religion. According to Paul, Christ and His salvation is prophesied and promised in the prophets (Rom. i. 2 f.); true righteousness, that avails before, and comes from, God, is not, indeed, produced by the law, but it is “witnessed by the law and by the prophets” (Rom. iii. 21). The law itself is a *παιδαγωγὸς εἰς Χριστόν* (Gal. iii. 24), and is, therefore, by having the new covenant as its aim, in internal connection with it. The whole course of treatment in John’s Gospel tends to show that the old covenant was fulfilled in Christ’s appearance (John. i. 46); hence the pervading reference to the Scriptures of the Old Testament, which is in part general, and partly in respect to particular historical features which are displayed in Jesus Christ. Indeed, even the characteristic utterance (John i. 17) cannot be otherwise understood than that this “grace and truth” stand in an inner connection with the law, the people of Israel being designated in ver. 11 the *ἱδιοὶ* of the *λόγος*. The Epistle to the Hebrews aims at showing forth both the unity of, and also the characteristic difference between, the two covenants, so that full salvation and the complete and per-

fect agent of salvation is first given in the new covenant. We thus find a characteristic mean, which is preserved throughout the apostolic teaching, between a doctrinal exposition which would remove all connection between the old and new covenants, and one which would identify the two.

However much the apostolical statements may assimilate the Christian life to the Old Testament form of piety, and however much this Christian life may be set forth in its peculiar character, still the apostolic teaching always declares that *man can participate in salvation only by faith in Jesus Christ, by means of a new birth proceeding from God*. As regards Paul's and John's writings, we need no special proof on this point; cf. for example, Rom. i. 16 f.; John xx. 31; 1 John v. 11. Even in Peter we find faith declared to be that on which salvation depends; and it is shown to be the Christian's duty to believe in Christ even without seeing Him (1 Pet. i. 5-9). This faith also involves a faith in God the Father (1 Pet. i. 21); and Christians, as true members of God's family, are styled *believers* (ii. 7-10). James takes faith as his subject throughout his whole epistle; but he demands the verification of faith. This faith is a faith in Jesus Christ the Lord of glory (ii. 1); and the question is, whether and how far this faith can save a man (ii. 14-26). There is no doubt but that a participation in the salvation and life of Christ depends upon faith, faith being effectual and perfected in works (ii. 22); but still the point is discussed as to the relation between faith and works. The apostles, likewise, all agree that a participation in salvation is brought about by faith as a new life from God, or that *faith is brought about by a new birth from God*; and that, consequently, a new principle of life has penetrated the personal life of the Christian, by his entering by faith into a fellowship with Jesus Christ (cf. 1 John iii. 9; Gal. iii. 21-28, vi. 15; Rom. vi. 11; Tit. iii. 5; 1 Pet. i. 3, 22, 23, ii. 2 ff.; Jas. i. 18). Consequently that which brings salvation is neither a merely historical faith in Jesus of Nazareth, nor moral works of man in themselves, nor a new life from God without the fellowship with Jesus Christ, the latter depending on faith.

All the apostolical writings set forth *the fellowship of believers in love*, and this is done with a certain necessity; for if, in faith in Christ, the new principle of life becomes an actual new life, an essentially new bond of union is formed between all believers,

the bond of community in love, which is rooted in this new life. For this reason, therefore, and also on material grounds, the apostles were compelled to lay a stress on this fellowship. For the more this new life severed believers from the rest of the world, the more necessary was it in every point of view to found a positive community based on the fellowship in the new life. This point is most copiously dwelt on in Paul's writings, the idea of this fellowship being in them more exactly developed as a Church. The organic, mutual connection of believers is often described by the figure of a *body* or a *temple*. John has laid down with the utmost emphasis that this community is to be framed *in love*. And in Peter, also, this doctrine is significantly set forth (1 Pet. ii. 4-10), for both the inward disposition and the outward arrangement of this fellowship are made the subjects of his teaching (1 Pet. i. 22, iii. 8 ff., iv. 8 ff., v. 1 ff.). James also gives a prominent place to the idea of the fellowship of believers in love, and desires that every outward distinction should be done away with in the unity of the new life (Jas. i. 9, ii., v. 1 ff.)—taking notice, however, of certain divisions into ranks among the members of the Christian community (Jas. v. 14, iii. 1). The Epistle to the Hebrews also recognises the importance of this fellowship in love. This is evident from ch. xiii. 1 ff., and also ch. xii. 1 ff., 22-24, where this fellowship in its highest sense, as embracing both heaven and earth, is plainly set forth. From ch. x. 25 and ch. xiii. we may observe how, in the narrower sense of our earthly lowliness, this fellowship is honoured.

All the didactic writings of the apostles speak of the *consummation of salvation by the perfected manifestation of Jesus Christ*. However forcibly *the state of salvation* may be represented as *actual* and characteristically penetrating into worldly life, it nevertheless always appears to be only of an *inchoative nature while on earth*, so that its consummation forms a subject of *hope*. No one can lay a greater stress than John on the present reality of the divine life in Christ, and yet he forcibly declares that its perfection is only a subject of hope (1 John iii. 2 f.). The *ἐλπίς* assumes the same position in Paul (Rom. viii. 24, v. 1 f., etc.). This consummation of salvation *depends on the perfected manifestation, or on the παρουσία of Christ* (1 John ii. 28, cf. 18, iii. 2; 1 Cor. i. 7, xv. 23; 1 Thess. iv. 15 ff.;

2 Thess. i. 3 ff.; 1 Pet. i. 7, 13, iv. 13, cf. v. 1, 4, 10; Jas. v. 7, 9, i. 12, ii. 5).

These essential points of unity in the apostolic writings depend on a religious view of the world which was rooted in the Scriptures of the Old Testament, and, in its New Testament form, forms the basis of the Scriptures of the latter. The main features of this view are as follows:—The world is absolutely created, maintained, ruled, and supported by God. God manifests Himself in the world, and is active in the world, but is Himself absolutely exalted above it. He is *holy* (Jas. i. 13), and the *sole source of life*; hence He is *good*, and giveth liberally (Jas. i. 5); He is also *love* (1 John iv. 8). *But the world is at enmity with God* (Jas. iv. 4), and in sin, which plainly is not from God (Jas. i. 13), but proceeds from the world. The world is therefore unclean, and contaminates those who are in contact with it (Jas. i. 27); it is subject to death (Jas. i. 15), and is perishable and transitory (Jas. i. 10 f.; 1 Pet. i. 24). But, in the midst of this perishable world, the attributes of which are shared by *πᾶσα σὰρξ* (1 Pet. i. 24), God is active, as the Father who has begotten mankind anew, as the first-fruits of His creatures (Jas. i. 18), and communicates a life from incorruptible seed, by means of the word of truth (1 Pet. i. 23–25). Thus *God*, by means of His absolute holiness and goodness, *establishes in this world His everlasting kingdom* (1 Cor. iv. 20, vi. 9 f.; Rom. v. 21, xiv. 17; 1 Pet. ii. 9 f., etc.). It will be subsequently shown that all the writings of the New Testament are based upon the main features of this biblical view of the world, which, however, is very variously developed. They are, indeed, so much a matter presupposed, that the apostolical teaching, in its more simple form, does not dwell upon these points with a view of giving any special instruction on them. The doctrines of Christian salvation grow out organically, therefore, from a very wide field. And it may readily be seen that, where the main points of such a religious view of the world were acknowledged, it only required the entry of the Saviour into the world, to enable the living plant of apostolical teaching to shoot forth on such fruitful soil.

Both in the main doctrines, and also in the religious view of the world, *the teaching of the apostles agrees with that of Jesus*; for all the main points of the former are found in the didactic discourses recorded by the evangelists, and the view of the world is

essentially the same in both. But still there is a difference between them, particularly in consequence of the continuous development of Christ's work. As His work was gradually accomplished, it is unmistakeable that, in the course of the life of Jesus Himself, there is a gradual advance in His testimony as to Himself. This is especially the case with the testimony as to His atoning death, and the communication of the Spirit. Not until after the conclusion of Christ's earthly appearance was His testimony developed into a whole; and not until after the work of Jesus had received its last confirmation, by the pouring out of the Spirit from Him as a heavenly glorified Redeemer, could the believers in Him enter fully into the fellowship of His life, and have a clear and distinct consciousness of it. But the more the personality of the Lord was unique in its kind, the more unique also His mode of teaching. His richness of forms could be at the command of Him alone; and this richness was needed to express the infinite purport of His consciousness, according to the susceptibility of His hearers. But the personality of the Lord also involved the utmost concentration in His comprehensive view. Hence, in all His many-sidedness of expression, there is no analysis, no mere conceptions, no use of subtleties; all is concrete and intuitive. This form of teaching could not pass on to the apostles; they were compelled to adopt a more conceptional and argumentative line of teaching; and hence the individual differences which all the illumination by the Divine Spirit failed to remove.

But there are other points which cause a distinction between the teaching of Christ and that of the apostles, namely, the difference in aim, in the men addressed, and in the circumstances generally. The apostles often found themselves confronted with communities in whom conviction might be presupposed; but they also had to do with Gentiles of very varied national culture. Generally speaking, the people to whom the apostles wrote were of different kinds; and therefore the aim differed in each individual epistle, varying according to the manifold modifications of temporal and local circumstances. All these things were otherwise in the didactic expositions of our Lord; for, although He never was in a position to follow a purely objective course of teaching, being always actuated by a distinct purpose in respect to men, time, or circumstances, still His teaching, on account of

its limitation to the Jews, was throughout different from that of the apostles. And yet, if the teaching of the Lord is compared with that of His disciples, there is more cause for wonder at the harmony than at the difference between them.

§ 54. *The Apostolic Teaching in general, considered with respect to the Differences therein—The Differences generally.*

Proceeding even on the dogmatic idea of inspiration, we cannot be surprised that the personalities of the apostles caused differences in their teaching. For, in those inspired or illuminated by the Spirit of God, the peculiarity of individualism is not removed, although purified and transformed. Still less could any external rule, or a mere concert among the apostles themselves, fetter the freedom of the living spirit. The more manifold the opposition to Christianity, and the more numerous the needs which its first preaching had to meet, the greater the necessity for a variety in their unity. As it was of the highest importance for the Church that the historical appearance of the Saviour should be recorded by several authors and not merely by one, so is it also a feature in the New Testament canon, intended for all times, that the apostolical teaching should be set forth by various men, all equally fitted both by calling and position. The more surely the destination of the gospel was universal in its aim, the more suitable to this aim was a didactic system which proceeded from various points of view, and, from the very beginning, was calculated to meet various needs, being subject to a variety of personal colouring. If, in the original apostolic teaching, this manifold variety had not existed, there would have been a danger of a one-sided view being taken, which might have hindered an energetic development of Christian doctrine, not merely for the earliest period, but even for all time to come. Thus, then, the differences in the apostolical teaching are of that kind that they do not refer merely to details, but extend to the whole of the doctrine, so, however, that they all keep within a certain mean, which was no less original than well adapted to preserve the whole teaching from degeneration.

But, although these differences do not refer merely to details, neither is the aggregate of apostolic teaching composed of heterogeneous elements without any mutual characteristics, nor are these elements so similar, that only a few details are variously

framed, so that the whole presents no diversified points of view. In seeking for the grounds of difference in the apostolical teaching, we must look for them *within Christianity, and in the circle of the apostles themselves*; and, on the other hand, the *mean* to which the apostolical teaching kept is both *original* and *conservative*. It is original, because, having made itself manifest among the apostles in the apostolic age, at unquestionable historical dates, it was not the result of a long course of ferment and disunion, by which a middle view would perhaps be arrived at. With regard to this, however, we must of course exercise an impartial interpretation. This original apostolical mean is also essentially conservative; for, so long as it was maintained, the teaching was preserved from those extremes which existed among the Ebionites, the Marcionites, and the school of the Gnostics generally. Thus the various statements of apostolical doctrine form links in a well-connected chain, and tend to confirm one another as a multiplicity of witnesses and testimony for the one great system of apostolic truth.

§ 55. *The Apostolical Teaching in general, considered with respect to the Differences therein—The Particular Fundamental Forms.*

In considering the actuating power which, being involved in Christianity itself, produces these differences in the development of Christian teaching, we must necessarily regard this power as being that special element of Christian truth and the centre-point of Christian teaching, namely, the doctrine of Christ's appearance as the fulfilment of the old covenant. The further development, both of the teaching as to Christ, and also of that as to salvation, were dependent on the way in which their relation to the old covenant was looked at. The idea of fulfilment involves two points—the connection between the two covenants, and the former being surpassed by the latter. The extreme view, in which only one or the other of these two points were maintained, did not exist within the apostolic circle. In the latter, the difference was a quantitative one; and from a greater stress being laid on one or the other point, arose the two fundamental forms of apostolical teaching, which therefore are distinct in their character, but yet such as would avoid any rupture in the apostolical Church.

The *first fundamental form of teaching* lays a greater stress on the unity of Christianity with the old covenant. In this two points are involved—the law, and prophecy: the first, as the divine

will actually conveyed ; and the second, pointing to the future as a living, continuous development of the provisional divine counsel. Hence arises a twofold type of this fundamental form : James taking as his principle that the Old Testament is to be taken as *law*, and that the gospel is therefore a perfected and fulfilled law ; on the other hand, we find that Peter represents the gospel as the fulfilment of Old Testament promise and prophecy, although the idea of the fulfilment of the Old Testament law in Christ is not disregarded. The two views are manifestly not accidental, because they pervade the whole of their didactic expositions, and are involved in the essence of the subject. In the first type, Christian life appears as if freed from sin ; and from this standpoint, therefore, we must expect a thoroughly *practical* exposition of doctrine. Christianity is the *fact* by which the law is fulfilled. In the second type, which is connected with prophecy, this practical side is not wanting,—for the prophets teach a future outpouring of the Spirit on all flesh, which is tested by a practical life in the Spirit,—but the fulfilment of prophecy will not rightly make itself apparent until the prophecy of Christ is represented as actually fulfilled. The appearance of Christ is therefore comprehended in all its completeness ; and Christological dogma is brought forward, in the first place, as the teaching as to the historical appearance of the Saviour. As in this the practical life of the Christian is presented, both the types of this first fundamental form of apostolical teaching represent Christianity as it is presented in Christ's appearance.

The *second fundamental form of teaching* has also developed a twofold type, only the relation between them is of a different kind. Christianity, as distinguished from the old covenant, is the main view of this line of teaching. It cannot, therefore, adhere to the forms of the old covenant, but must be carried out by a positive development of the peculiarity of the new covenant. This peculiarity is redeeming grace in Christ ; therefore the teaching as to Christ, which in the first fundamental form was more taken for granted, is now dwelt upon. Within the field thus traced out, Paul, in the first place, keeps to the contrast presented by the Old Testament law, and lays down the main proposition, that Christianity is not a law, but the gospel of the grace of God. But although the negative side of his teaching, viz. that man cannot be saved by the law, is, in the first place, based on his

teaching as to sin, still the positive side, that grace redeems, must proceed on Christological ground, and the doctrine of the redeeming agency of Christ must be carefully developed. In the Pauline epistles, there are, however, ever increasing indications of a movement towards the Christological side. The Apostle John represents the gospel chiefly as distinguished from the old covenant, inasmuch as it is neither law nor prophecy, but is something more than these, comprehending all primitive elements in the person of Christ. John has not to contend, like Paul, for the acknowledgment of this distinction, but appears to be in the quiet possession of it (cf. John i. 17). The distinction between that which existed and that which had been, is connected with the person of the Mediator, through whom the law, and also grace and truth, have entered into human life. The only-begotten Son alone hath seen God and declared Him to us (John i. 18). John can, without hindrance, carry out that to which his individuality appears to urge him, and make his teaching as to the person of Christ both his commencing point and chief subject; but Paul is compelled to argue on the anthropological side. Also, in the last period of the apostolical age, a one-sided idealism made its appearance, especially as regarded the person of Christ, manifesting itself also, as it appears, in an antinomian tendency (cf. 1 John iii.): against this view John's writings evidently desire to contend. In the form of contemplation, he surveys the unity of the ideal and the real, of the idea and the fact: he proceeds on the fundamental view that that which from the beginning had been hidden in the Father, the *ζωὴ αἰώνιος*, has become the subject of the most complete historical experience, first of all to the apostles (1 John i. 1 ff.). John's exposition of the subject is intuitive; that is, the elements are not arranged and explained, and the truth is not brought to bear by means of any dialectical line of argument. In his statement of doctrine, we meet with grand and comprehensive ideas forming the main facts of the peculiar Christian consciousness, and resting on the main facts of the gospel.

As our result, we have, then, the apostolical teaching of the New Testament in two fundamental shapes, each of which is represented by a twofold type. In each case, both the internal connection and also the internal differences are clear. This result, therefore, is well adapted to confirm the idea that we have

correctly hit upon the point in respect to which the various forms of apostolical teaching have been organically framed. It also appears that the remainder of the New Testament writings, the historical as well as the didactic books, follow respectively these four forms of teaching, so far as regards their didactic Christian character. To the *first fundamental form of teaching* belong the Gospels of Matthew and Mark; and we shall have occasion to compare James' line of teaching with the Gospel of Matthew, although the latter also appears to point to the Petrine system. The Gospel of Mark must be compared with the doctrinal form of Peter. In comparing the Epistle of James with that of Jude, we shall find that the latter forms a transition to the Petrine system. With the Epistle of Jude we must, however, also compare the second Epistle of Peter, for the satisfaction of the critical question, whether, when considered from the standpoint of New Testament theology, this epistle is linked on to the Petrine system or not. As regards the *second fundamental form of teaching*, we shall have to compare the Pauline system with the historical books written by Luke, and, among the didactic writings, with the Epistle to the Hebrews, which, like Paul, places in the foreground the redeeming agency of Christ, and strives and contends to prove the superiority of Christianity over the old covenant, but yet at the same time takes a decided step in advance in the development of the Christological dogma, and points so plainly to the doctrine of the *Logos*, that it forms a transition to the *system followed by John*. This latter line of teaching, which we shall have to represent as it is laid down in the first Epistle of John and his Gospel, in the latter, chiefly according to the portions in which the evangelist speaks in his own name, must be compared with the Book of Revelation, with a view to the question of its origin when considered in relation to the other writings of John.

I THE FIRST FUNDAMENTAL FORM OF THE VARIOUS APOSTOLICAL SYSTEMS OF TEACHING;

OR, CHRISTIANITY CONSIDERED IN ITS UNITY WITH THE OLD TESTAMENT.

I. THE APOSTOLICAL TEACHING OF JAMES.

§ 56. *His Epistle.*

The author of this epistle styles himself *the servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ*; a designation which might, of course, indicate an apostle, but yet expresses some wider idea, and gives us cause to conclude that the name of James was well known in his time as that of a man of distinction in the Church. This James addressed a circular epistle *to the twelve tribes which are scattered abroad*. It is to be understood as a matter of course, that the author has Christians in view as those who represented the Jewish nation in his eyes, consequently the Jewish Christians of all tribes scattered among the nations outside Palestine. Perhaps, however, both Jewish and Gentile Christians are meant, who lived dispersed in every direction.

This circular epistle has been handed down to us in our canon, although it is placed among the *ἀντιλεγόμενα*. On the other hand, its antiquity was acknowledged without question in the ancient Church, as, according to Eusebius, ancient authors already appealed to it as an authority. It was evidently made use of by Clemens Romanus (*Ep. I. ad Cor.* c. x.), and portions of the *Pastor* of Hermas are unmistakeably based upon passages of James' Epistle. We must, therefore, if we would deny that the latter was composed in the apostolic ages, very considerably reduce the antiquity of these writings, or most unnaturally assume that they were all derived from some common source. Added to this, the epistle has been quoted by some of the most eminent fathers of the Church as the work of the Apostle James, and was received into the canon of the most ancient Syrian translation of the New Testament, and was therefore esteemed as canonical in the Church which was closely connected with the Christian community at Jerusalem and with James. On the other hand, this epistle certainly appears to presuppose other New Testament data. It has been supposed

that elements of the Pauline epistles, as those to the Galatians and Romans, also of the Epistle to the Hebrews and the first of Peter, have been alluded to or made use of in the Epistle of James. Now on this point caution must certainly be used. From the nature of the contents of the epistle, it cannot be asserted that everything in it was derived from general Christian and Old Testament ideas without any reference to Paul; but it might be that it referred to some of the well-known Pauline *dicta* or mode of teaching, such as Abraham's justification by faith, of which, as Paul's teaching, many at that time must have been aware, who were unacquainted with the epistles either to the Galatians or Romans. But even if the analogy with certain Pauline passages should lead us to believe that these epistles had been made use of, at the most the result would be, as indicated, indeed, by other circumstances, that the Epistle of James *was written not long before the destruction of Jerusalem*. There is no evident proof that in this epistle we have the most ancient writing of the apostolic age (Schneckenburger). We find also in the epistle evidence of a degeneracy in Christian communities, and, in addition, the presupposition of a somewhat long existence of Jewish-Christian churches outside Palestine. Christians were in danger, owing to their trials, of becoming unfaithful to their belief (ch. i. 2 ff., 12), and of giving themselves up to a dead faith, in contrast to one which manifested itself by works (ch. i. 22 f. ii.). Love had grown cold, and in connection with this there was a pressing forward to become teachers in the Church (ch. iii. 1 f.); a spirit of litigiousness had arisen, and a life entirely conformed to the world (ch. iv., v.), combined with a want of love and a violation of true brotherly affection, by a preference given to the rich and distinguished, forgetting that the main and essential point does not depend on externals, but on the new life begotten by God through His quickening word (ch. i. 18). At the same time, the Church,—which, although called *συναγωγή* (ch. ii. 2), is not to be understood as the Jewish synagogue, in which these Christians were still in the habit of assembling with the Jews, but as the Church named after it,—was organized by its elders. All these indications point to a not very early period in the apostolic age; but, on the other hand, not to a post-apostolic time, for circumstances of this kind were certainly features of the Christian

community in the apostolic age (1 Cor. i. and ii.; Col. ii. 1; 1 Cor. xi. 21, vi. 2 ff., etc.).

This epistle is doubtless intended to claim as its author that *James* who was for a long period *at the head of the Church of Jerusalem* (Acts xii. 17, xv. 13 ff., xxi. 18), and was reckoned by Paul as *one of the pillars of the Church* (Gal. ii. 9), being styled the *brother of the Lord* (Gal. i. 19). The position of this James with regard to Paul can be best understood from the language of Paul himself (Gal. ii. 1-14), in a passage which modern criticism has made an unwarrantable use of, by founding on it the theory of an irremediable dissension between the apostles. Whoever reads this passage just as it stands, will see that in it James acknowledges the independent apostolical authority of Paul, professes himself to be a minister of the gospel in brotherly fellowship with him, requiring, indeed, no alteration in his teaching, and plainly *not desiring* that the Gentile Christians should be bound to keep the Mosaical law. In Acts xv. we find James taking up a similar position; and, in respect to the question discussed in the Church at Jerusalem as to the relation to be observed between the Gentile Christians and the law, he gives a decision quite in the same spirit as that which we observe in Gal. ii. Both in the Epistle to the Galatians, and also in the Acts of the Apostles, his attitude on these points appears that of an apostolic man who comprehended Christianity essentially in its harmony with the old covenant. But for this very reason, although he was an apostle of the Jewish Christians, and the head of the mother Church of Jerusalem, his attitude towards Paul was quite different from that of the Ebionite party, which was altogether hostilely inclined towards the Gentile apostle. The *παρείσακτοι ψευδαδελφοί* must have unrighteously made their way, not merely into the Gentile Christian Church of Antioch, but also into the Christian community generally; for in Gal. i. Paul regards the Galatian heretics as desiring to pervert the Galatians from the grace of Jesus Christ into another gospel, and expresses a curse against them. Although, in Gal. ii. 12, those who came from Jerusalem are called *οἱ ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου*, it does not follow that they were sent by James with an improper purpose. Of course, they looked upon James as their chief. But how often do we see disciples going further than their master? Is it not, however, possible that James had a full

conviction that salvation depended solely on a believing apprehension of Jesus Christ? If it were otherwise, how could he have given to Paul the right hand of fellowship? It may perhaps be assumed that James, *more* than Peter, considered it proper to observe the law as a matter of theocratical piety. From Hegesippus, whose account of James shows a colouring of Ebionite party feeling, and from Josephus, we learn that James was surnamed *the Just* on account of his strictly moral and legal life, and that he suffered martyrdom shortly before the destruction of Jerusalem.

The personality of James, as previously depicted, harmonizes to a high degree with the purport and form of this epistle; and the arguments brought forward against its genuineness, which are derived from its contents, setting aside any external evidence, can be readily refuted. Especially that (1) the epistle is wanting in any individuality; and (2) that the dogmatic matter points to a later date of composition. As to the first point, this epistle cannot be said to be wanting in all individuality, and least of all in those features which characterized the highly esteemed James. Only read what has been said of this epistle by Herder¹ and Kern,² two unprejudiced and thorough students of it. The peculiar power of the book is, indeed, surprising to many readers; also the urging on to action, and the practical tendency which does not specially dwell upon dogma; whilst, added to this, the nature of Christianity in its practical tendency is beautifully and accurately set forth as the one power which can impart a new life from God to men, and thus save their souls. The style is sententious and gnome-like, with beautiful and simple imagery derived from nature. If we compare with this epistle any of the edifying works which we possess of the second century, how peculiar and forcible does the former appear! With regard to the second point, that the dogmatic character points to a later age, it is said (Schwegler) that the form of Ebionitism is here so mild that the epistle cannot belong to the apostolical age. But certainly, if a zealous Ebionite is expected to be found, a mistake is made as to the author. It has been added that no distinct inducing cause for this epistle can anywhere be recognised, and that the epistolary form must be mere fiction. But its aim is

¹ *Die Briefe zweier Brüder des Herrn in unsrem Canon.*

² *Commentar zum Brief Jacobi.*

in fact clear, namely, to strive against a barren Christianity, which admitted of a worldly life of pleasure, and useless dissensions, especially also doctrinal dissensions. As regards the external evidence, the state of the case is exaggerated if it is asserted that there is complete silence as to this epistle during the first two centuries. And Credner has very justly drawn attention to the point, that the uncertainty whether James the brother of the Lord was an apostle or not, had exercised some influence over the conduct of the ancient Church with respect to James' Epistle.

The question, *Whether James was an apostle or not?* is a difficult one to decide. Some of the ancient testimony is in favour of the affirmative view, and some in favour of the negative. The usual opinion distinguishes James who was at the head of the Church in Jerusalem, and was the author of the epistle we are considering, who also is said to have died a violent death before the destruction of Jerusalem, from the Apostle James, the son of Alphæus; so that the former was, indeed, the brother of the Lord, but *not* an apostle. In modern times his apostolic dignity has been vindicated by Wieseler and others; but yet on various grounds his idea is improbable. As regards, first of all, the high estimation in which James was held, this belonged to a later period of the apostolical age, at a time when the apostles as a body no longer lived in Jerusalem, and when the somewhat late conversion of James (cf. John vii. 3–5) was no longer fresh in memory, so that his high authority is easily explicable. Added to this, there is no doubt that the *attributes of James*, even if he were not an apostle, might have obtained for him in the course of time great authority amongst the Jewish Christians. In the first place, he must have been for a considerable time in daily intercourse with Jesus (John ii. 12, vii. 3, 4). If we assume that James was induced to become a believer by the appearance of the Risen One, we may look upon him as identical with the James mentioned 1 Cor. xv. 7, or not. At all events, the brethren of Jesus are expressly named among the faithful after the ascension (Acts i. 14), whilst before they had been unbelievers (John vii. 5). The Lord Himself, too, after His resurrection, appears to have sent to His brethren ("Go tell my brethren," Matt. xxviii. 10; John xx. 17, —an expression which is chosen so as not to be limited to the disciples). The Judaistic opponents of Paul do not appear to

have required more than these points as the requisites for the apostleship (1 Cor. ix. 1); and no more could be needed for the highest personal authority. If James thus became a believer, the importance of his earlier intercourse with the Lord would thus increase in the eyes of other Christians, especially of the later converted; and, looking at the material tendency of Judaism, the bodily relationship must have had the effect of elevating him above all non-apostles, and perhaps over the apostles themselves. In addition, we must consider the mental, and especially the moral, personality of this James. According to all the traces to be found of him in history, his was an exceedingly moral, powerful, energetic character. He was a man perfect in all things (Jas. i. 4); and at the same time his piety was chiefly exercised in the Old Testament form,—a tendency which produced him high reputation among the Jewish people. This reacted on the Christian Church, which still shared in the temple-worship, and, under the guidance of such a person, obtained much approval among the yet unconverted Jews who assembled in Jerusalem for the feasts. All this seems to announce an apostle-like authority; but it cannot be proved that the Jewish Christians claimed *in thesi* apostolical dignity for James. Paul mentions his name before even Peter and John; but this priority may arise from the fact that with the Judaizing Christians in Galatia the name of James may, in fact, have had the greatest weight. Certainly in the Acts of the Apostles James is not mentioned as the Lord's brother; two apostles named James being mentioned, one of whom was beheaded at an early date, and of the other no details are subsequently given. But if the Acts of the Apostles was chiefly calculated for Jewish Christians, they must have been so well acquainted with the person of their James that any further description of him was not needed. The passage Gal. i. 19 can be very easily explained without making out "James the Lord's brother" to be an apostle. The supposition, that in the passages Gal. i. 19 and ii. 9 two persons are meant, is manifestly erroneous.

Whether James were an apostle or not, Paul expressly says that in the apostolical time *he was looked upon as one of the pillars of the Church*. His doctrinal statements in our canon are therefore, at all events, of high interest. James represents, also, a peculiar tendency which had its determined position in the organic development of apostolical teaching, and historically coincided, without

doubt, with the position taken by the afore-mentioned James in Jerusalem.

§ 57. *The Teaching of James—The Fundamental Principle.*

James proceeds upon a subjective view of Christianity, and makes this the real subject of his statement, only referring to the objective side occasionally, with the aim of more closely defining or further developing the former. This view coincides with the practical aim of the epistle, and is caused by the entire bent of the author's mind, and consequently, also, by the mode in which he comprehended objective Christianity, and defined the idea of God and Christ. The appropriated Christian life is the province to which he devotes himself, and this is made the subject of his epistle. Subjective Christianity is represented by James, in the first place, as *faith* (ch. i. 3, 6–8, ii. 1, 5, 14–26, v. 15).

As regards the *nature of faith*, it is in its inner form a *confidence devoid of doubt* (ch. i. 6), “nothing wavering” (ver. 6), excluding all weakness and double-mindedness (ver. 8). Faith embraces in itself a moral unity and steadfastness, being attained by means of trials. Faith is therefore essentially *practical*, so that it cannot be really possessed unless it is manifested in action (ch. ii. 1 ff.). It is not merely a believing knowledge,—for devils also believe in the one God, but their belief is coupled with a guilty consciousness (ii. 19),—but it is a living faith which manifests itself (i. 3). It cannot, therefore, be separated from works without becoming in itself something dead (ii. 17, 26), being, on the contrary, an active principle and impulsive power in men. The *object of this faith* is, first, the one God (ii. 19), the Creator and Lord of the world and men, who are only induced by folly and sin to forget their dependence on Him (iv. 13–17) “who is able to save and to destroy,” the *Κύριος*, conformably to the Old Testament יְהוָה (i. 7, cf. 5, 12, iv. 15, v. 10, 11; on the contrary, in v. 14, 15, Christ may be understood). He is also called *Κύριος σαβαώθ* (v. 4), and *Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ* (i. 27, iii. 9), as the fatherly Creator. But the faith is also *in Jesus Christ*, and in Him most decisively as the exalted and glorified Lord (i. 1, ii. 1, v. 7, 8). This faith is, indeed, not set forth in detail, the only point to which prominence is given being that of the *παρουσία* (v. 7, 8), in which Jesus the *Κύριος* will appear as Judge. However simple these features may be, it is, nevertheless, sufficiently sig-

nificant that Jesus is throughout designated as *Κύριος*, and that this *Κύριος* Jesus is named in juxtaposition with God (i. 1),—a significance which is strengthened by the addition *τῆς δόξης*, since *δόξα* is the specific expression for the divine glory. The attribute *κριτῆς* also alternates between Him (v. 9) and God (iv. 12). The Christology is not carried further in this epistle. Jesus is represented as the Judge; but His office as Redeemer, and the facts of His life, on which this office is based, are not mentioned; therefore the practical faith is taken for the most part as a monotheistic faith in God.

The *relation of faith to justification* (ii. 14–26) forms the culminating point of the didactic element of the epistle. In this section, justification is designated by the word *δικαιοῦσθαι* (vers. 21, 24, 25), used by Paul, and also by Jesus Himself (Luke xviii. 14). This, however, is the only place in which James employs the word, and it has somewhat the appearance as if he had borrowed it from other sources, especially as he is here evidently endeavouring to set aside some view of the relation of faith to justification which he did not consider to be the correct one. The idea of justification is (in James) contained in *σῶσαι* (ii. 14) as the general designation of salvation (i. 21), and is explained (ii. 23) by *λογίζεσθαι εἰς δικαιοσύνην* and *φίλον Θεοῦ κληθῆναι*. In this, James, like Paul (Rom. iv. 3), has referred to Gen. xv. 6, and understands the meaning of justification to be *to declare righteous*, to treat as righteous, and place in a friendly relation to God.

In this epistle justification is said to be *conditional, not on faith alone, but on works* (ii. 21, 24, 25; cf. Heb. xi. 17, 31). But when James says *ἐξ ἔργων, πίστις* is not excluded. The works are those of faith, not works simply as such. He merely opposes the delusion that justification was conditional on bare faith which is without works, and therefore dead (ver. 26). The *ἔργα*, then, are not works of the law,—that is, not works performed without faith in Christ, and merely as a fulfilment of the Old Testament law; and the whole development of the subject shows that James is speaking of works by which faith may manifest its vitality and activity,—but they are fruits of, and not identical with faith, although he says that no real faith can be without works. A man cannot show faith without works, but, where works exist, faith may be proved by them. A merely theoretical belief without works is the faith of devils, not of Christians (ver. 19),—a

dead and empty faith (vers. 17, 20, 26). Whoever depends on a faith of this kind is an *ἄνθρωπος κενός* (ver. 20). Whilst James attributes a real and Christian character to that faith only which is efficacious, and therefore practical, he will acknowledge no works as Christian and justifying before God but those in which faith is shown (ver. 18), and is perfected (ver. 22). We must not forget that, in the Epistle of James, faith is referred to Jesus Christ in a more general and indefinite way than by St. Paul, the death of Christ and His atoning power not being mentioned by the former. The works which James commends are the fruits of faith, but not identical with it; and justification is therefore, in his epistle, made conditional on works effected by virtue of faith, and not on faith in itself. Paul, on the other hand, makes justification dependent on faith alone. Nevertheless the difference between them might be thought much greater than it really is. James and Paul entirely agree in a negative assertion, which is, indeed, of a twofold nature. (1) As regards the legal standpoint of the Old Testament as maintained by the Judaists, both say that justification *is not dependent on the works of the law*. Paul develops this proposition polemically; and although James does not actually bring it forward, the sense of it is involved in his teaching. And also, (2) as regards a merely theoretical Christianity, both agree in a principle which is in the first place negative, that justification *is not made conditional on a dead faith*. This is the point which James argues polemically, and Paul most decidedly opposes in intention, when he desires "a faith which worketh by love" (Gal. v. 6). But in positive doctrine there is a difference between Paul and James; so that it might be said that faith, so long as it is without works, *does justify*, according to Paul, and *does not justify*, according to James. But, looking at James' statements, this sharp line of distinction is not quite a correct one. The deepest ground of difference between them of course is, that James looks upon faith without works as dead, and that Paul most fully recognises the vitality of faith in itself, before even it has produced works,—that it may be and is a principle of life so far as it embraces Christ, and exactly so far a condition of justification, apart from the fact whether it has been developed in works. John also agrees with this Pauline doctrine, most distinctly stating that faith in itself is the victory which overcometh the world (1 John v. 4). Paul and John decidedly

go back to the first principle of faith, and regard it in this position, whilst James looks first to the Christian life as it is shown forth, in which, faith, on its appearance, immediately has operated in some way or to some extent, and is actively engaged. James, therefore, says that faith without works is dead, as the body without the soul. But this very comparison should remind us of the necessity of not misunderstanding James. He certainly did not intend that works were the soul and faith the body. Does he not always revert to faith when he wants to point out what should be done or left undone (*e.g.* ch. ii. 1 ff., i. 3, iv. 7, 8)? He must, therefore, by no means be understood as meaning to imply that God would by works only recognise the genuineness of faith; for to Him, the Omniscient, the true nature of faith must be plainly evident ere it has had time to show itself in works. If, therefore, James had been asked whether a faith, in itself living, can justify the subject, although no time were allowed for this faith to prove itself by works, he certainly could not have denied it; for his view of faith and regeneration tends to this, although he has no occasion to give further development to the idea of faith. He had not to do with readers who in penitence recognised their guilt and moral impotence (this he desires for them, iv. 9, 10), but with those who contented themselves with, and boasted in, a merely theoretical, historical faith; and, being devoid of love, and despisers of poor and lowly brethren (ii. 1 ff.), presumed to be teachers and scribes. For this reason he calls their attention to the useless nature of a dead faith. Another reason why he cannot be considered to ascribe any justifying power to works *per se* may be gathered from his teaching as to the forgiveness of sins. In the words *πολλὰ γὰρ πταίμεν ἅπαντες* (iii. 2) he acknowledges that works even of faith are but imperfect; also that true Christians need the forgiveness of sins (v. 15, 16, 20); and the sins of those who have sinned to a certain extent may be forgiven on the condition of repentance and believing prayer, in the first place, the intercession of others. The judgment which they are to expect is one of mercy (ii. 13). All this is, however, implied in the expression *λογίζεσθαι εἰς δικαιοσύνην* (ii. 23): man, although a sinner, will be looked on and treated by God as righteous. According, therefore, to James, man is blessed in his actions (i. 25); but these are actions of faith.

Christianity, objectively considered, appears to James as the

law, and indeed the perfect law of liberty (i. 25, ii. 12). We have now to inquire into the idea of this law, and its connection with the subjective view of Christianity.

The law of liberty is *the divine word*, the λόγος, which is spoken of in ch. i. 22, 23, which was to be received by his readers with meekness (ver. 21). It is the word which has the power of salvation, δυνάμενος σῶσαι τὰς ψυχάς, called in ver. 18 the word of truth. As a law, it is to him the divine rule of human conduct. From this point of view, he represents the λόγος (i. 22-25) as a word which man must obey in action, in contrast to the mere hearing (vers. 23, 24), which produces no abiding change in conduct; and, inasmuch as the divine word prescribes the conduct of man, it is a νόμος. Thus, therefore, James here understands Christianity in its practical signification as laying down a rule for the will and independent conduct of man. But, while thus making it a parallel to the Old Testament religion, he also attributes to it certain distinguishing peculiarities. It is, in his view, the *perfect law*, the νόμος τέλειος, and the νόμος τῆς ἐλευθερίας. James elsewhere uses the word τέλειος in the province of morality (i. 4, iii. 2), applying it always to something entire and complete. Christianity is the law of liberty, in that, through a spiritual and moral birth, it frees from sin (i. 25). This is in full harmony with the utterance of Jesus, that the word of truth sets free from the bondage of sin, and that He, the Son, as that word, would set men free (John viii. 32-36). Whosoever looks with desire into this divine word, it will become to him the law which will free him from all his natural disposition (i. 25), from all the ensnaring power of ἐπιθυμίαι (cf. vers. 14, 15). Whoever feels this inward impulse will be a ποιητὴς ἔργου (i. 25), and it will be to him an internal, and no mere external, rule and power, in virtue of which he will act willingly and without compulsion (cf. Rom. viii., 1 Cor. iii., where this aspect of Christianity is emphatically developed by Paul). The Rabbis have a saying, that whoever takes upon himself the yoke of the law is free from the yoke of the world. The way, however, in which James follows the words of Jesus renders it probable that he had His teaching in view. He thus became conscious that God, who is in Himself holy, who in liberal and ungrudging love is the imparting source of all good and perfect gifts (i. 5), morally begets men to a new life through the word of truth, which is no longer

a dead letter as regards men, but is internal, *ἐμφυτος* (i. 21), and by the spiritually creative power of grace is changed into a spiritual life. This conception of the practical tendency of Christianity may find an explanation in James' personal character and course of life; for James was not converted in the same way as Paul, and had not suddenly turned with all the fire of his energy from one side to the other. He had, on the contrary, become a pillar of the Church by a continued development of quiet power; and in him the transition from the old to the new covenant took place perhaps almost insensibly, in the contemplation of the mighty proofs of Christ's efficacy. This idea of the freedom of Christianity has been explained by Paul, chiefly in reference to the point that a freedom from the statutory laws of Mosaism is therein involved (Gal. v. 1 ff., iv. 1 ff.; Rom. vii. 1 ff.). The question now arises, whether James followed out the idea to this consequence. This much, at least, is certain, that in his view salvation (i. 21) is dependent on the renewal through God's grace (i. 18), and that the fulfilment of the Old Testament law is not set forth by him as the service which is pure and unblemished in the judgment of a fatherly God, and consequently well-pleasing to Him; but the service which He commands is the fulfilment of the law of love and of inward purity (i. 27), which keeps itself unspotted from the world. He therefore describes the law of love, of love of one's neighbour, as the royal law (ii. 8), in the same spirit in which Jesus (Matt. xxii.) answered the question as to the greatest commandment. Thus he certainly did not consider the statutory law of Moses as a condition of salvation, nor is there any sign whatever that he required his readers to observe it. But, whether his teaching went so far as to imply in this *ἐλευθερία* a freedom from any obligation as regards the ceremonial element of the law of Moses, we cannot say with certainty, taking into consideration both his idea of *ἐλευθερία* and also the fact that he nowhere mentions the statutory law. It might, of course, have been the case that his readers were already zealous in following the law, and that James intended, by his silence on the point, merely to lead them to recognise that the true nature of Christian piety consisted in a deeper morality, and not in this external observance (i. 26 f.). At all events, however, it is certain that James by no means looked upon the observance of the statutory law as essential to salvation. If this had been the case,

he must have spoken of it, especially in the face of the large number of Pauline Christians with whom the Jewish Christians came in contact; and it would have been a matter of conscience to say that the observance of the general moral law was not sufficient, instead of merely reminding his readers of the moral commandments of the decalogue (ii. 10 f.). But still it remains an open question, whether he did not look upon the continuous observance of the Mosaic usages as an obligation laid on the Jewish Christians, not, indeed, as a condition for salvation, but as a means of showing their alliance with the people of the old covenant, and of alluring them to faith in Jesus. Quite in harmony with the above are the accounts in the Epistle to the Galatians and the Acts of the Apostles, in which James is represented as not desiring to subject the Gentile Christians to circumcision, but as, perhaps, expecting that the Jewish converts should observe the law. According to this, the same moral freedom was, of course, to be planted in the sinner by the word of truth; by means of which freedom the sinner not only henceforth fulfils the divine will, but has no obligation laid on him to observe the statutory law as necessary to his salvation, although he may obey it from motives of piety and loyalty. James would have pronounced this freedom of the Gentile Christians in the same sense as Paul might accommodate himself to the observance of the law.

This view of objective Christianity agrees entirely with that of the subjective side taken in this epistle. If salvation depends on faith which manifests itself in action, Christianity must be a power directing this action; and, on the other hand, if Christianity is a law, its operation must be the activity of faith. Christianity is called a law in other parts of the New Testament. We will only mention the *ἐντολή* (1 John ii. 7, 8, iii. 22–24), and the *νόμος πίστεως* (Rom. iii. 27), and the *νόμος τοῦ πνεύματος τῆς ζωῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ* (Rom. viii. 2); but this idea is not placed in the foreground as by James.

James also shapes his idea of God principally in its practical aspect. In his view, God is not only *the Lord*,—a conception which includes the perfect independence of the Deity and the perfect dependence of man,—but he also specially displays His moral attributes, partly as inherent, as the absolutely Holy One, partly as transitive, as the God imparting Himself in absolute

love. He is the one Lawgiver, not merely in the Old Testament, but also in Christianity; and also the one Judge; for He not only lays down a rule of conduct, but also Himself administers this rule. He it is, too, who is able not only to destroy, but also to deliver and save (iv. 12, i. 21); for He is both God and Father (i. 27), the fatherly-minded Creator, in whose image man is made (iii. 9). He is "very pitiful, and of tender mercy" (v. 11), and is in Himself holy and unchangeably good. In Him there is no variableness or shadow of turning (i. 17), and from Him every good and perfect gift proceeds. He "cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth He any man" (i. 13), but stands opposed, indeed, to all sin. He is specially represented as begetting Christians with the word of truth as first-fruits of His creatures (i. 18), and choosing them, not only to be rich in faith, but also to receive the kingdom and crown of life (ii. 5, i. 12). This practical idea of God corresponds exactly with the conception of Christianity as the perfect law of liberty; and the fact of the author turning his attention more to works, the realization of the moral rule, than to faith, the principle of moral conduct, will naturally explain the predilection shown in this epistle for applying the idea of the *law* to *Christianity*, and that of the *Lawgiver* and *Judge* to God. But as James adopts this mode of defining the idea of God, it may appear strange that his epistle does not specially set forth the bringing about of God's communication of Himself through Christ, and in the Holy Spirit. It is readily seen how indispensable the person of Christ is in our epistle, and how highly it is placed by the author. It must be Christ who effects the new birth through the word of truth; but how this is effected is not clearly stated. And even the operation of this engendering by means of the Holy Spirit is not expressly mentioned. We only notice that those are to be considered as Christians in whom the Holy Spirit dwells (iv. 5; cf. Isa. lxiii. 7-11).

The doctrines of Christ and the Holy Ghost are therefore treated by James only as an hypothesis on which he himself affords no developed teaching, and from which he but seldom derives any practical motives. Thus the dogmatical development is thrown into the background as compared with the practical.

The motives for his exhortations which are chosen by James, are of a specially Christian character. Thus he derives them from

Christ and from the Divine Spirit. Whoever believes in Jesus Christ, the Lord of glory, must love all the brethren equally for Christ's sake. In the midst of partiality and respect for persons this faith cannot be really possessed. On the closely impending appearance of Christ as the Judge (v. 7-9) James grounds his exhortation that Christians should be patient, and in this waiting hope should stablish themselves, and not to grudge one against another. Whether the words τὸ τέλος Κυρίου (v. 11) refer to Christ is doubtful. He also derives his motives from the Christian salvation. Thus he appeals to everlasting salvation and a participation in the kingdom as promised for the future (i. 12, ii. 5). But, even setting aside all reference to the future, he grounds his motives on the high dignity of Christians, in order both to fortify believers under affliction (i. 9), and also to move them to love towards poor brethren (ii. 5). He also appeals to the δικαιοσύνη and its requisite condition (i. 20, iii. 18); and, as regards objective Christianity, we know that he takes it as a law of liberty, and founds special exhortations thereon. From all this, we may gather that James entertained the ideas which were peculiar to Christianity, although he does not widely develope them. They lie in the depths of his consciousness, and all that is wanting is their express and detailed statement. In other places, however, and, indeed, exactly where James goes into wider explanations, he derives his motives from general religious and moral ideas, such as were entertained under the Old Testament dispensation. Thus he takes as motives the physical dependence of man on God (iv. 13 f.), God as Judge (iv. 12), and the impending judgment (v. 1-6); also the true idea of the worship of God (i. 27), the Old Testament command of love to one's neighbour (ii. 8), the innate nature of man as in the image of God (iii. 9), and the nature of the irrational creation (iii. 3, 11, 12). From the Old Testament, also, as instances of patience, he takes the prophets and Job (v. 10), and Elias as an instance of effectual prayer (v. 17).

§ 58. *The Teaching of James—Particular Doctrines.*

The teaching of James as to *sin* is distinguished by its deep earnestness, just as might be expected from the practical tendency of his epistle.

In his view, *sin* is *individual* in worldliness and opposition to

God (iv. 4, 5). *Sin*—that which is to be abhorred in man—is *ἐχθρα τοῦ Θεοῦ*, and exists wherever there is love to the world. It forms, therefore, a positive contrariety to God, and is absolutely incompatible with the love of God as the absolutely good. This hostility to God and worldliness is sin, and may exist either as a desire or in overt action. The desires which strive in men inwardly, either against one another, or with the better emotions of the mind, which partly originate and partly find their instruments in man's members (iv. 1, 3 ; cf. Rom. vii. 23, vi. 13), and from the inward contest of which the inclination to conflict and quarrelling is outwardly shown (iv. 1),—these are desires in which a pleasure is taken, being assented to, nourished, and cherished by the human will, and are already so far actual sin. They annihilate the whole Christian life, and are based upon an inward enmity towards God (iv. 4). So long as man seeks to combine the love of the world with that of God, nothing but enmity to God will be attained to ; and from these desires proceed sinful actions, as well as sinful omissions (iv. 17). These *ἡδοναὶ* are therefore distinguished from the *ἐπιθυμία* (i. 15), which appears only as a tempter from which sin proceeds, but is not yet in itself sin. Sin has its origin in man himself : God tempts not to evil. And for this idea James appeals, not only to the holiness of God, but also to the psychological origin of sin. The activity of the free will is here represented under the image of an act of generation. Sin is the mutual production of the alluring desire and the assenting will. James' doctrine of the individual man being the free causality of sin, is a correct expression of the moral consciousness in man, and must be combined with the relation of dependence in which, in some respect, even sin stands towards God. The New Testament, so far, agrees with James' theory, as in the former the personal guilt of the sinner is everywhere acknowledged and prominently set forth. But it is, also, elsewhere in the New Testament acknowledged (Rom. ix. 17–19) that sin is dependent on God,—that is, it is included in His counsel and plan for the world ; and that sin is common to the whole of mankind is clearly shown by Paul (Rom. v. 12 ff.). The more forcibly this aspect of sin is premised in other parts of the New Testament, the more important is it that James has so prominently displayed the other. It must not, however, be forgotten that, in the section where James does

this (i. 13-15), *ἁμαρτία* is actual sin, and he speaks of no other sin. All this is fully consistent with the character of James' teaching. Looking as he does upon Christianity as the law of liberty, sin is, in his view, the transgression of the law, consequently actual sin. Understanding and acknowledging the Christian life as a practical matter, sin is to him also of a practical nature. Faith justifies when it is perfected in works, and sin is first produced when the *ἐπιθυμία* fructifies, and inwardly or outwardly is consummated. James does not here go back to the principle, but looks upon sin as the actual transgression of the perfect law. He does not, however, say that the *ἰδία ἐπιθυμία* (i. 14) is something entirely without guilt: it draws and allures the will. It may be readily seen that it appears to him as a tempting serpent, although he does not so express it. How deeply men, in James' view, are entangled in sin, and how closely he approaches the idea of evil propensity, is clearly evident from his statement that men are in need of redemption (i. 21, ii. 14, v. 20), and that they must be born again through the word of truth, so as to belong to the first-fruits of God's creatures (i. 18), although originally created in God's image (iii. 9), from which original condition, even in man's present state, a certain peculiar dignity accrues.

Another point in his teaching as to sin is, that it *brings with it death or ruin* (i. 15, v. 20). *Θάνατος* is the evil which is generally united with sin, bodily death being included in the idea. This is understood by James to be, in the first place, only the consequence of actual sin (i. 15). This ruin is connected with the guilt which accompanies every sin; and each individual sin makes a man guilty as regards the whole law (ii. 10). The idea of guilt is necessarily followed by that of judgment (ii. 12, 13, iv. 12, v. 12), which James so forcibly sets forth and unites with Christ's *παρουσία* (v. 9). It is the law by which judgment is brought about (ii. 12); the one Lawgiver is also the one Judge (iv. 12); and the sins of men cry to God, *i.e.* they provoke God's judgment. Christ being considered as the Judge, throws a remarkable light, on the one hand, on the author's idea of the person of Christ, which he thus cannot but regard as in the closest union with God; and, on the other, on his teaching as to the perfect law of liberty, which is identical with the redeeming word of truth springing from Christ. Christ, therefore, is to be looked

upon also as the giver of the perfect law of liberty, so far as He is regarded in unity with God.

The idea of the *common participation in sin* is not, indeed, unfolded by James; but he warns the whole body of his readers against sin, and gives prominence to the fact that "in many things we offend all" (iii. 2). Individuals, too, are exhorted to confess their sins one to another, and mutually to pray for one another (v. 16). This presupposes that, as the helping out of sin is an action common to all, so also the falling into sin, and the progress in it, by mutual temptation, seduction, and aggravation, is a guilt participated in by all. That James really assumed this, is shown by his warning against sins of the tongue (iii. 2 ff.). The idea of the *κόσμος* (iii. 6, i. 27, iv. 4, ii. 5) includes the common participation in sin. For, as nature attains to any moral relation only through its connection with the world of men, this *κόσμος* must be looked upon as representing mankind as standing in hostile contrariety to God. But it is not in mankind only that James recognises sin, but in the *διάβολος* also (iv. 7), and in the *δαιμόνια* (ii. 19), who believe, indeed, that there is one God, but manifest their alienation from God by trembling at Him. The devil is also represented here as tempting man to sin; for men are required to resist him (iv. 7). All resistance to the devil is made conditional on unreserved submission to God, who giveth grace to the humble (iv. 6).

The *transition from sin to a state of salvation* is but briefly touched upon in this epistle. When the sinner, in the *φιλία τοῦ κόσμου*, has become an *ἐχθρὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ* (iv. 4), he cannot attain to salvation, except by turning to the directly opposite principle to that he has hitherto paid allegiance to. This is the *ἐπιστροφή*, in which even a fellow-man can assist (v. 20). The man must *ἐπιστρέφειν ἐκ πλάνης ὁδοῦ αὐτοῦ* (ver. 19), and receive from God meekly, and without opposition, the engrafted word, which is able to save his soul (i. 21). This conversion is a self-humiliation before God (iv. 6 f.), a drawing nigh to God (ver. 8), so that the hands of the sinner are cleansed, and the heart which formerly belonged to the world, or was divided between the world and God, becomes purified. This, however, takes for granted that man feels himself miserable; and this consciousness of the personal misery of sin will then be accompanied with mourning and heaviness (ver. 9). This self-humiliation is the condition

requisite for the exaltation proceeding from God's grace (ver. 10). Although James looks upon his readers as Christians, he requires this penitence from them; for among them he supposes an entire class living in worldly lusts and arrogance, and in enmity towards their God (iv. 4).

In James' teaching as to *salvation*, we shall distinguish its general nature, and the side which he specially sets forth.

The *general idea* of salvation is understood by James, in harmony with the whole of the New Testament, both negatively as *redemption*, and positively as *new life*. In the first place, it appears negatively as *redemption* (ii. 14), and, indeed, *σῶσαι τὰς ψυχὰς ἐκ θανάτου* (i. 21, v. 20). Therein is contained, (1) the forgiveness of sins (v. 15, 20); (2) conversion from sin (v. 19), or, laying aside all moral impurity (i. 21); and, (3) the deliverance from the judgment of God (ii. 13 f.). The positive idea of salvation is comprehended by James in that of spiritual exaltation (i. 9). This is a work of the Lord. Objectively considered, it is *χάρις* (iv. 6), and includes the new birth proceeding from God (i. 18). It might appear strange that this new birth is not specially ascribed to the interposition of the divine Spirit; but it is, in fact, expressly described as an act of God, and it was of practical moment that the intervention of the word of truth should be prominently set forth. It might further appear that, according to this epistle, man had to make the commencement in this spiritual process of the new birth: *Ἐγγίσατε τῷ Θεῷ καὶ ἐγγιεῖ ὑμῶν* (iv. 8). But God, from whom every good gift springs, is He from whom the word of truth comes. God calls through the word; and those who are called accept it, and thus experience His liberating and redeeming power. Now, this word must certainly be received; and we must so far draw nigh to God, in order to experience the benefits of the divine word. The new life which is commenced in this birth is the faith in Jesus Christ completing itself in works, as a life which is pure and opposed to all selfishness and love of the world. Whoever has this life is justified before God (ii. 21-25), and this justification is an imputation of righteousness (ver. 23), since a new life succeeds the old life of sin, not by the work or deserving of man, but as God's gift. He who is thus justified is even in this world "blessed in his deed" (i. 25), especially in the patient endurance of temptation (i. 12). All earthly lowliness vanishes before this spiritual

exaltation (i. 9), all poverty before this spiritual wealth (ii. 5). But this salvation goes far beyond the present world, and, in the future, receives full consummation as *ζωή* in the widest sense (i. 12), which is at once life, and a crown of honour, and a glorious reward; it is also a *βασιλεία* (ii. 5; cf. 1 Cor. vi. 9; Rom. viii. 17; Gal. iv. 7). We may assume, perhaps, that this *βασιλεία*, which God has promised to those who love Him, and have thus proved their faith, is intended by James to be connected with the Lord's *παρουσία*, since both in ch. v. 7, and also in i. 12, he is exhorting to patience.

From the fundamental idea which pervades the whole epistle, we may readily perceive *which aspect of salvation* James had chiefly in view, viz. a state of salvation *as practical, energetic Christian life*. He devotes his epistle to the exposition of this side of the question. His sole reason for this certainly was not because he considered it the most important, but also for the sake of his readers' necessities. He represents the Christian life, on the one hand, as fulfilment of the law and the service of God; on the other, as wisdom. The Christian life is *fulfilment of the law* (ii. 10), namely, the performance of the perfect law of liberty (i. 22-25), just as sin is the transgression of the same (ii. 9, 11). In harmony with this, genuine faith is made perfect in works (ii. 22). This doing the divine work is the true *service of God* (i. 26 f.), which consists partly in keeping oneself unspotted from the world, and partly in fulfilling the law, and especially the "royal law" of love (ii. 8), disinterestedly and impartially (ii. 2 ff.). Any merely external service of God, which is not united with a complete observance of the law and strict moral self-command, and is not proved by a practical exercise of brotherly love and unspotted purity from the world, is nothing but self-deceit (i. 26). In both respects, the Christian life is *δικαιοσύνη*, which is chiefly understood as a Christian shaping of our social relations, —a man becoming righteous by works of faith (ii. 24, 21). The other aspect of the Christian life is *wisdom* (i. 5, iii. 13-17), as a gift of God which comes from above, and therefore presupposes and has in itself moral purity, and, especially in relation to fellow-men, is exhibited by all the social virtues. From James representing the practical Christian life in these two chief aspects, it might appear that he only taught the Old Testament idea of piety; but in truth this is not the case. In the first place, we

must note that the fulfilment of the law and wisdom are set forth by James in the very purest shape. The wisdom which he speaks of is neither an earthly and merely intellectual, nor a selfish wisdom, but a heavenly, and in itself pure (iii. 17), being a fruit of faith (i. 5 f.). And in representing the Christian life as the fulfilment of the law, the law, as he understands it, is not a multitude of commands and prohibitions, but a living unity (ii. 10-12), depending on the unity of the Lawgiver and Judge (ii. 11, iv. 12). Thus the fulfilment of the law is nothing but a living obedience to God and to His holy will (i. 13, 17); and all the moral requirements which are laid down as necessary for man's salvation are summed up in *love to God* (i. 12, ii. 5). All this is certainly common to the Old Testament (Deut. vi. 5; Lev. xix. 18); but it is also the spiritual kernel of the law, the spiritual climax of the Old Testament, as it was set forth by the Lord Himself (Matt. xxii. 34-40), which James has propounded. The idea of God's service is in a similar position (cf. Mic. vi. 6-8; Jer. vii. 21; Isa. i. 10-17; Matt. v. 23 f., xv. 3-9). But James goes further than the Old Testament, in representing the whole Christian life as bound up with faith, and as something perfect proceeding from faith,—a new life proceeding from God (i. 18, 21). The whole Christian life is here set forth as God's production, brought about by the word of truth, consequently through the gospel. By this, in virtue of the gracious will of God, men are newly begotten as first-fruits of His creatures. As the Old Testament nation was the first-born of God, so now Christians have attained to this dignity. Doubtless, in the Old Testament, too, intimations were given of a new man and a new heart; but what was then a promise, this is now recognised by James as fulfilled. In his view, all righteousness is before God an imputation of the same (ii. 23), and has its warranty only in God's judgment and approbation, but is thus accepted by Him even when not devoid of error and sin (iii. 2, v. 15). From an open and willing comprehension of the word, united with self-knowledge, as of a man beholding his face in the mirror of this word, proceeds a continuous course of action. But this action comes from faith, and the comprehension of the word takes place in faith. The essential portion of this word is therefore Christ, as the subject of this faith. The development of Christian life resting, then, on this foundation, the decided character, the unity and purity of the moral life, stand out

prominently as the love of God in absolute contrariety to the world (iv. 4, 8). Christian morality is acknowledged in all its unconditional character. It claims the whole man, and all his commissions and omissions, that all in him should be in harmony with the inner principle (iii. 11 f., i. 4). As the negative side of the moral life, we have the denial of self and of the world (i. 27), of wrath (ver. 19), of bitter envy and strife (iii. 16), and of inward selfish lusts (iv. 1–3). From all these must Christians keep themselves, as well as from unbridled talking (iii. 1–10), and from language which loses sight of reverence and religious dependence (iv. 14 f.); also from all unbrotherly censuring (iv. 11 f.), and all dealings with the lusts of the world and injustice (v. 1–6, iv. 1–3). Opposed to this stands the positive side, the perfection of humility, partly general, as the acknowledgment of dependence on the almighty God (iv. 13–15), and partly as self-humiliation before the Lord as sinners (iv. 8–10); added to this, meekness (iii. 13), a yielding temper, gentleness, and peaceableness (ver. 27); also impartial love, especially towards the lowly (i. 27, ii. 1, 3), and patience (v. 10 f., i. 12). The life of the Christian community, which is specially considered, is founded in the impartial love which springs from faith, and is openly manifested towards others. James mentions the assemblies of Christians by the name of *συναγωγή* (ii. 2; cf. Heb. x. 25), and always speaks of brethren even where he is not addressing his readers. This brotherly fellowship has a certain organization: there are elders of the *ἐκκλησία* (v. 14). In this social life James presupposes *prayer*, which is, in his view, generally essential to Christian life (i. 5–8, iv. 2, 3), and is the direct expression of faith as a confident, undoubting asking (i. 6 f.). This prayer was, moreover, to be used in the community as an intercession, as for the sick, to whom the elders of the Church were to be called. Bodily deliverance and recovery are promised as the result of believing prayer and anointing with oil in the name of the Lord; in close connection with which follows the forgiveness of any special sins which may have stood in a peculiar relation to the state of sickness (v. 14 f.; cf. 1 Cor. xi. 30). For this reason, the intercessory prayer is to be combined with a mutual confession of sins (ver. 16). James also appeals to the efficacy of the earnest prayer of a righteous man, as shown in the instance of the prophet Elias (ver. 17 f.). Among the moral points upon

which James lays special stress, is the warning against an oath (v. 12). James requires entire abstinence from oaths generally without any limitation, and thus keeps to the words of the Lord. He forbids them as something which may expose men to condemnation, and demands that the simple statement should be the pure truth. Thus an oath is unnecessary when a Christian has to do only with his fellows.

§ 59. *The Teaching of James—The Character of his System.*

According to James, Christianity is principally an energetic moral life, which has its principle in the word of truth, by which the Christian is newly begotten by God. In this point, and in the relation to faith in Jesus Christ, the peculiarity of Christianity is decidedly acknowledged. But, as the mode in which this salvation is founded on and brought about by Christ and in the Holy Spirit is not further developed in his epistle, his representation of Christianity seems to be allied to the ideas which are common both to the later and the old covenant. Added to this, the author represents the word of truth, to which he ascribes the liberating power, as a law, with the purpose of drawing a parallel between the two covenants. If this peculiarity be not duly considered, James' teaching certainly appears very deficient. Thus it has been said in modern days, that James' Christianity is nothing but an improved law, with the addition of the command of love, the prohibition from an oath, etc., united with the promise of salvation, but that the chief contents of the Mosaical law were still required (cf. Köstlin's *Johanneischen Lehrbegriff*). But James' idea of the *νόμος τέλειος* is far from being thus exhausted. It also involves that all that he enjoins is attained to in man by the new birth through the word of truth: whereby it is this word which saves the soul; it is the law of liberty which sets free. Prophecy shows that man needed this, and that it was to be expected in the days of the Messiah (Ezek. xxxvi. 26 f.; Jer. xxxi. 31-34). James recognised this, and laid such stress upon it, that he makes the whole life of the Christian dependent upon it (ii. 10-12). We may judge from this how little right we have to look upon the epistle as simply an Ebionite production, or as bearing the stamp of an Ebionite tendency, purposely accommodating itself outwardly only to the Pauline doctrines. The view that works and faith

are merely placed side by side is not a just one. We have, we trust, succeeded in showing the organic unity of the two ideas, and this is the best answer to such criticisms. Undoubtedly James has not enlarged upon the person and work of Christ; but we must take into account the relation which exists between the subjective and objective conceptions of salvation, which mutually supplement one another. From the subjective we must infer the objective side; and from the teaching as to salvation, that of the person of Christ. James' recognition, that salvation was a new life coming from God, and brought about by the Christian word of truth, involves the conclusion that he looked upon Christ as something greater than the noblest instruments in the Old Testament theocracy. Elias was usually ranked second only to Moses; but James speaks of him as of a man like ourselves. Christ, on the contrary, he calls the Lord of glory, and in i. 1 names Him in the same breath with God. Although in God he recognises the one Lawgiver and Judge, he nevertheless represents Christ as the Judge whose *παρουσία* is close at hand. It has been thought that, in v. 6, in the "just one" Christ is intended to be meant; but, from the context, it is the injury of poor Christians which is referred to. As James represents salvation as a new life, he must, at all events, have regarded in Christ something essentially new, and have looked upon Him as the intervener to convey this divine power to men. But the point which is not at all brought forward is the atoning function of the Redeemer. This fact, however, bears a certain connection with the practical standpoint of our epistle.

This treatment of Christian doctrine is intelligible, in the first place, looking at the very nature of Christianity; for, on one side, it is the fulfilment of the old covenant, and practical Christian life has one element in which it closely approaches the practical piety of the Old Testament believers. But there is this distinction, that this life does not take its rise on legal ground as such, but from something to which James gives an analogous designation—*νόμος τέλειος τῆς ἐλευθερίας*. In the New Testament, we find representations of Christian life from the lips of the Lord Himself, which give great prominence to this side. It is, therefore, in itself permissible; and it seems all the more natural that James should have taken this view, if we consider his historical circumstances. It was probable, from the nature

of the call, that this view, which set forth the continuity of Christianity with the old covenant, should be the first to make its appearance, and that this should take place in the Jewish Christian community at Jerusalem; and, from the personal history of James, it was equally probable that he should be the very man who would propound this view. Probability seems in favour of the author of this epistle not having been an apostle, but a natural brother of the Lord. In Mark vi. 3 four *brothers* of the Lord are named, and, being mentioned in connection with their mother, could not well be merely *cousins*. These brethren, according to John vii. 3-10, did not believe in their brother during His earthly life. They were outwardly very near to Jesus; but this outward nearness became a mental wall of partition between them and the brother who was inwardly so specially exalted above them. James, used from his childhood to a faithful and strict piety, followed a moral and religious course peculiar to himself. Doubtless he was often stirred up by the sight of the brother, who must have appeared to him as a wonder, but yet he failed to recognise that which His mother from the very first saw in Him. Thus he developed into an earnest, and, from an Old Testament point of view, pious character, but, in the first place, outside Jesus' sphere of spiritual life. But the more candid and honest his character, the more candid and honest was his righteousness; and when, with his brethren, by means of Christ's resurrection, he was led to faith in Him as the glorified Messiah, the more he held this *δικαιοσύνη* as the essential matter. Now, perhaps, he experienced that in this faith he first became free, and was, as it were, begotten of God, but that it was no rude contrast to his previous state, in which, more or less unconsciously, he had derived somewhat from the fulness of Jesus Christ. Thus it seemed to him that all he had in Christ was to be looked upon only as the perfecting of what he had before. James, therefore, forms that middle term between the apostolic circle and the Jewish nation, which we have described as so providential in its character. He might thus live in Jerusalem, not only as the acknowledged head of the Jewish Christian community, but also, on account of his zeal for the law, as a man highly esteemed among the Jews themselves. As a man standing in this position, and with a view of making peace, at a time when Paul was in captivity or had ended his

course, and party hatred had begun to fire up so vehemently, he felt called on to interpose with an epistle of this kind, and once more to throw the weight of his authority and his convictions into the scale in favour of peace. Especially was he called on now, in the face of the doctrinal and practical errors, the commencement of which we find described in the first Epistle to the Corinthians, which, however, had now reached a far wider development. Error appears already to have taken that turn which attributes to God the origin of sin; and degeneracy hesitated not to maintain that indifference of life was compatible with an outward confession of faith. But James could not have come forward as he has done in this epistle, if he had been an extreme party man; but, as the pillar of the Church, who (according to the Epistle to the Galatians) held out to Paul the hand of brotherhood, and (according to the Acts) was enabled to take a position far above all party feeling, the course he adopted was fully open to him. The fact that doubt was thrown upon the canonicity of his epistle so early, and for so long a time, is explained, even looking at the authority which he held in his own sphere, by the opinion which led to nothing but the writings of apostles, or those works which had been subject to apostolic examination, being received into the canon. In conclusion, we cannot fail to see how characteristic, historically important, and providentially arranged, the position of James was, and how much it is a subject of thanksgiving that we possess this evangelical testimony from his hand.

§ 60. *Comparison of James' System of Doctrine with the Gospel of St. Matthew.*

The comparison of an apostolic didactic work of this kind with one of the gospels has a twofold interest. In the first place, to show how the apostle connects his teaching with that of Jesus Himself, and to what extent it is derived from that source; and, on the other hand, how far his doctrines are reflected in the historical views of the evangelist.

The Epistle of James coincides even with John's Gospel in the fundamental view of Christianity as the word of truth, which sets free, and is common to all (Jas. i. 18, 25; John viii. 31 ff.); and this is an element in which he really goes beyond the sphere of the synoptical discourses. There are fewer points of coincidence

with the Gospel of St. Mark, the latter giving special prominence to the historical matter. The same remark applies to Luke's Gospel, in which the matter is chosen with a view to Paul's contest against the Judaizing party; although we cannot be surprised at finding frequent coincidences with James' Epistle in the copious discourses, especially those of an ethical character, which this gospel contains. With Matthew, on the contrary, James agrees not only in numerous separate passages, which appear to be but the echo of those discourses of Jesus which bear reference to the moral life in God's kingdom, but also in that great body of precepts which Matthew gives as a grand whole (chs. v.-vii.), the Sermon on the Mount, which in its whole spirit may be looked upon as the model of James' Epistle. James' fundamental view of objective Christianity as the perfect law of liberty is based on Matt. v. 17-19, the theme of the whole discourse, the fulfilment of the law and the prophets. Both James and Matthew follow out the idea of the fulfilment of prophecy only so far as it is involved in the fulfilment of the law. As James recognises the new law as the only essential one, without, however, entirely setting aside the old law, so also, in the Sermon on the Mount, we find that fulfilment of the law in sense and spirit is advocated which goes beyond its mere actual form, although still preserving it. In connection with the objective view of Christianity, we find James' idea of God the same as that which meets us in the Sermon on the Mount, as the holy and the perfect One (Matt. v. 48), the Founder of the law (Matt. v. 17-19), the Judge who can both save and destroy (vers. 22-30); as He who, full of love, gives every good and perfect gift (vers. 45, vii. 9-11), especially the Holy Spirit, to them that ask Him (cf. Luke xi. 13; Jas. i. 17; Matt. vii. 7-11; Jas. i. 5-7). Matthew and James both specially designate God as *Father*; the former representing Christ as Him for whose sake His disciples will have to suffer (Matt. v. 11), as the Lord (Matt. vii. 21 f.), and as the Judge (Matt. vii. 22 f.), whilst James also recognises Him as the Lord and Judge. The Sermon on the Mount presupposes rather than displays the Messiahship of Jesus; and this feature, too, we find in James' treatment. As regards the fundamental view of subjective Christianity, in the Sermon on the Mount it is brought before us as *δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ*, as it avails and appears in God's sight (Matt. vi. 33), with which man must be filled from above (v. 6), which, however, must be better

than that of the scribes and Pharisees (v. 20). James likewise sets forth Christianity as righteousness; and, as the Sermon on the Mount understands this righteousness to be a doing of the divine will (Matt. vii. 21), or of the law (Matt. v. 19), in contrast to the mere saying, "Lord, Lord!" so also James lays a stress on faith being perfected in works,—for faith may be recognised through works, as a tree by its fruits (Matt. vii. 16–20). And as the Sermon on the Mount represents love to one's neighbour as the essence of the law and the prophets (Matt. vii. 12), so James declares it to be the royal law (ii. 8). We now have to consider the separate items of doctrine which are presented to us both in James' Epistles and the Sermon on the Mount. Sin appears as the *ἐργάζεσθαι ἀνομίαν*, or as actual sin (Matt. vii. 23; cf. Jas. i. 15, ii. 9). But this actual sin is involved not merely in the overt act, but also in thought and word (Matt. v. 22, 28; Jas. i. 19, 20, 26, ch. iii.). The transition to a state of salvation is constituted by repentance as a humbling of the heart before God, as an earnest longing for righteousness, by which the need of redemption is acknowledged in all its depth, and as an honest desire for that which is good (Matt. v. 3, 4, 6, 8; Jas. iv. 8 ff.). The aim and end of the Christian is the kingdom of God (Matt. vi. 33; Jas. ii. 5). James' teaching as to the spiritual birth of the Christian finds no complete model in the Sermon on the Mount (cf. John iii. 3); but we must take into consideration what the Lord says of the children of God (Matt. v. 9, 45) and of the children of the kingdom (xiii. 28). If, however, we go closely into the details of the Epistle of St. James, it is surprising how great a similarity to the Sermon on the Mount pervades the whole of it. Among these points of similarity (also coinciding with other utterances in the Synoptists) are—the joy in temptation (Jas. i. 2; Matt. v. 12); prayer for wisdom (Jas. i. 5; Matt. vii. 7, 11; Luke xxi. 14 f.); God's liberal and loving giving (Jas. i. 5; Matt. vii. 11); the necessity of faith in prayer (Jas. i. 6 f.; Matt. xxi. 22); the warning against wrath (Jas. i. 19 f.; Matt. v. 22); the commendation of gentleness (Jas. i. 21, iii. 13; Matt. v. 4); the earnest injunction to be doers of the divine word (Jas. i. 22; Matt. vii. 24, 26); the taming of the tongue (Jas. i. 26; Matt. v. 22); the utterance, that the poor are heirs of the kingdom (Jas. ii. 5; Matt. v. 3; Luke vi. 20); the royal law of love (Jas. ii. 8; Matt. vii. 12, xxii. 36 ff.); mercy in connection with

God's judgment (Jas. ii. 13 ; Matt. v. 7. 9, 13, xxv. 34 ff.), and the judgment on the unmerciful (Jas. ii. 13 ; Matt. vii. 2) ; the tree and its fruits (Jas. iii. 12 ; Matt. vii. 16) ; the importance of peaceableness (Jas. iii. 18 ; Matt. v. 9) ; a true prayer being heard (expressed negatively, Jas. iv. 3 ; positively, Matt. vii. 8) ; the friendship of the world is enmity to God (Jas. iv. 4 ; Matt. vi. 24) ; self-humiliation (Jas. iv. 6, 10 ; Matt. xxiii. 12, xviii. 4) ; the purification of the heart (Jas. iv. 8 ; Matt. v. 8) ; mourning for sin (Jas. iv. 9 ; Matt. v. 4 ; Luke vi. 25) ; judgment of brethren (Jas. iv. 11 f. ; Matt. vii. 1 ff.) ; dependence on God (Jas. iv. 13-16 ; Matt. vi. 25) ; the perishableness of earthly treasures (Jas. v. 2 ff. ; Matt. vi. 19 f. ; Luke xii. 19 ff.) ; the unresisting spirit of the righteous (Jas. v. 6 ; Matt. v. 39 ff.) ; the expectation of our Lord's second appearing (Jas. v. 7-9 ; Matt. vii. 21-23 ; xvi. 27, chs. xxiv. and xxv.) ; the persecution of the prophets (Jas. v. 10 ; Matt. v. 12) ; and the warning against oaths (Jas. v. 12 ; Matt. v. 34 ff.). The form, also, of James' Epistle bears an evident similarity to the Sermon on the Mount in its sententious language and figurative style, especially in the abundance of images derived from nature and mankind. Notwithstanding all this, we would not desire to place James' Epistle on an equal level with the Sermon on the Mount, which latter, both in form and purport, testifies to its origin from the Lord Himself. It is more profound, more many-sided in its utterances, and more perspicacious. It is also more comprehensive in its theme. But it must, notwithstanding, be clear to every one that a brother of the Lord, who was perhaps one of the hearers of the Sermon on the Mount, and was much with Him, might well entertain such views and employ such a mode of statement.

But whatever points of alliance there may be between James' Epistle and Matthew's Gospel, we must not lose sight of the fact that the discourses of Jesus in the latter go far beyond the epistle, and are not limited to the elements of doctrine. Matthew has recorded other discourses, from which it is very plain what part of the law was to cease and vanish away owing to its completion in Christ. The Sermon on the Mount says nothing expressly as to this ; for it was requisite first to throw light upon the positive building of the law. Another point disregarded by James is intimated in the Sermon on the Mount—the alteration and defacing of the law by the interpretations and applications of the scribes,

which we find decidedly and directly opposed in subsequent discourses. If we consider the more liberal interpretations of the law given by our Lord in the discourses recorded by Matthew, also, that God's or Christ's kingdom is intended for all men (xxvi. 13, xxviii. 19, viii. 11), that Israel is rejected as the theocratic nation (xxi. 43 f., viii. 12), and the destruction of the temple is intimated (xxiv. 1), we may recognise that, although, according to Matthew's Gospel, the substance of the Old Testament is fulfilled, the temporary and local forms of its law are abolished. Fulfilled prophecy, which is not enlarged upon in the Sermon on the Mount, is widely developed in the rest of the gospel; and we find many passages in Matthew which refer to the fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy in the person and work of Christ. The evidence of this will be found, on examination, to pervade the whole gospel. Added to this, Matthew possesses many historical and didactic elements which tend to form a copious Christology; and, as regards the person of Christ, records all the weightiest facts which form a part of our Lord's Messianic life, and also the very important discourses in which Jesus enlarges on the peculiarity of His person (xi. 27, xxvi. 64, xxii. 41-45, xxi. 37). Other discourses refer to Christ's work. He is the Judge of all nations (xxv. 31 ff., xvi. 27, vii. 22 f.), who will return in glory (xxv. 19-xxv. 46), as king (xv. 34, 40). But He is also the Redeemer who is come to save that which is lost (xviii. 11, ix. 11-14), and He it is who atones through His blood (xxvi. 28,) and baptizes with the Holy Ghost and with fire. Although it is a question how far Matthew was personally acquainted with all the events and sayings which he records in his history, there can be little doubt that, if he had written a didactic epistle, he would have entered more largely than James into the Christological element. But, on the other hand, from the mere non-occurrence of certain matter in a didactic epistle, we are scarcely ever justified in inferring either a want of knowledge or disapprobation of this matter on the part of the author. Notwithstanding all this, there is still a great similarity between the two works in question. There is, indeed, a causal connection between them; for James evidently formed his views to some extent from the Sermon on the Mount, and similar discourses of the Lord. Both, too, have fundamentally one and the same tendency; for, although Matthew enters so copiously and profoundly into the whole Messianic appearance of

the Lord, nevertheless his standpoint is the unity of Christianity and the old covenant, or the fulfilment of the latter. In harmony with this is the fact, that the gospel was chiefly intended for Christians of the Jewish nation. This comparison may thus serve as a hint to us, how little we are justified in limiting this tendency to the person of James, although he may appear as its most distinguished representative.

§ 61. *Comparison of James' System of Doctrine with the Epistle of Jude.*

Looking at the discussions of the last ten years, we may consider the result of modern criticism as favourable to the genuineness of Jude's Epistle. Most of those, in particular, who have held the second Epistle of Peter to be not genuine, have formed a different opinion as to that of Jude. The author describes himself as the brother of James, doubtless of the best known and most distinguished of the name, therefore the brother of the Lord (Matt. xiii. 55). Credner dates the epistle about the year 80, when Simon was bishop of Jerusalem, and under him heresies had secretly crept in which were subsequently outwardly developed (cf. Eusebius, iv. 22 ; iii. 32). We may judge from Eusebius (iii. 20) that Jude was not living at the time of Domitian. The epistle is not addressed to the Christians of any particular place, but to all believers generally who had remained true and faithful ; but yet the author may have sent it to one or more churches. After the death of James, Jude, his younger brother, was doubtless one of the most distinguished Christians in the Church of Palestine, and had every right to come forward with warnings against the heresies which were creeping in. The heresies are pointed out in a description which is interwoven with the warning intimation of judgment which forms the chief purport of the epistle. Their two chief features are named in ver. 4, and further enlarged upon in vers. 8-13, 16, cf. ver. 18 f. They are first described as dreamers defiling the flesh, despising dominion, and blaspheming dignities. In all things open to their perception they corrupt themselves ; but what they do not know, that they blaspheme. We cannot well interpret *δοξαι* (ver. 8) as earthly authorities, for *οὐκ οἶδασι* would then seem too forcible. Referring to ver. 9, we must apply it to the higher powers of the invisible world. This, too, must be the meaning of the *abstractum*

κυριότης,—firstly, the *μόνος δεσπότης καὶ Κύριος* (ver. 4), and then the lower *κυριότητες* of the invisible world. They would acknowledge nothing above themselves, and blasphemed what others revered; and this bold egotism turned into gross carnality. Jude describes these degenerate Christians most characteristically in very forcible natural imagery (vers. 12, 13). Vers. 16, 18, and 19 are also characteristic. *Ψυχικοὶ* completely describes the coarsely sensual libertinism, which degenerated into a denial of the Spirit and the whole spirit-world; for, towards the end of the apostolic age, this lawlessness and libertinism made their appearance in the grossest forms, partly in and partly outside the Gnosticism which was then arising, and was common ground both for the above-named errors and also the opposite extreme of exaggerated asceticism (cf. Col. ii. 16 ff.). Jude describes this antichristian libertinism as already in existence; but from his grasping its nature so profoundly, and depicting it so truly, we have a representation of its general character applicable to all ages. And the epistle has, so far, a certain prophetic character, and bears some analogy to the apocalyptic statement. Jude, however, intimates that all were not irrecoverably lost who had in any way shared in this libertinism; for he summons those who remained faithful to receive some with compassion, and to save others with fear (ver. 22). The latter are already caught by the fire of judgment, but still they may be plucked out. These words, and those that follow, indicate very decided and powerful measures. The external belongings of these people, the garment spotted with the flesh, is to be abominated, lest the community should be defiled by outward fellowship with them (cf. 1 Cor. v. 6). This epistle is, at all events, a production of great original power, and also an instructive parallel to the standpoint which is represented by James' Epistle.

On examining the didactic and hortatory elements of Jude's Epistle, we notice,—

(a) That *all the essential points of Christian consciousness are therein touched upon*. The object of all the teaching and exhortation is *ἡ κοινὴ σωτηρία* (ver. 3). This salvation is, on the one hand, *future* (vers. 21, 24), the object of believing expectation and “looking for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ unto eternal life” (ver. 21); and included with this is the presentation before the presence of the divine glory (ver. 24), which is to take place in the future. But salvation is also represented as *present*. Christians

are sanctified (loved, in another reading) by God the Father, and preserved in Christ; and on them mercy, peace, and love are multiplied now, and not in a spiritual future. It is a *grace* which has been already received (ver. 4), but on the right use of which salvation depends. We may notice (vers. 3, 20) how great a stress is laid on faith, that the faith received should be held fast, indeed built up upon and striven for. Faith certainly appears here in its objective signification; but the word of God, once delivered to the saints, is to be vitally believed (ver. 3), so that the edifice of spiritual life is to be built thereon (ver. 20),—faith thus appearing a subjective condition of salvation. Added to this, the denial of the Lord Jesus Christ forms the direct opposite to the state of a true Christian (ver. 4); and in every stage of the divine economy of grace, in the old covenant as in the new, unbelief was the object of God's displeasure and judgment (ver. 5). But salvation, as it is realized both in the present and future, includes man's presentation as faultless before the divine glory (ver. 24), that is, that he will be regarded and treated by God as faultless (justification); also, that man is inwardly purified or sanctified (loved), and preserved in fellowship with Christ (ver. 1). This preservation is spontaneous on the Christian's part, but presupposes that believers have been thought worthy of God's love, have experienced it, and have maintained, lived, and walked in this belief. Jude's Epistle, therefore, evidently embraces both sides of the idea of salvation—justification, and the state of renewal or sanctification.

But not only salvation, but also the cause of salvation, is touched upon in our epistle, and is ascribed to the grace of God,—that is, His free love in receiving sinners (ver. 4); being thus referred to the one God as our Saviour (ver. 25). But although the final cause of salvation is thus so surely ascribed to God the Father, the intervening agency is as decidedly acknowledged as resting in Jesus Christ, and also in the Holy Ghost. Those who are called and sanctified by God the Father, and preserved in Jesus Christ, are the true Christians (ver. 1); and in ver. 25 the wish of the doxology, viz. the glorification of God, is expressly alluded to as brought about by Jesus Christ our Lord.¹ Jesus

¹ This is not so in the English version, which follows the *text. recept.*; but the best mss., including the Alexandrine, Vatican, and Ephraemi, add, after the word Saviour, ὁ αὐτὸς Χριστὸς τοῦ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν.—Tit.

Christ is therefore called (ver. 4) ὁ μόνος δεσπότης καὶ Κύριος ἡμῶν, the denial of whom is the greatest contrariety to the idea of a Christian.¹ He is called *Ruler* in reference to His ruling agency extending over the whole world, and *Lord*, because we are dependent upon Him for our salvation,—Κύριος being the usual translation of יְהוָה, pointing to God in His revealed capacity, which was perfected in Christ's redeeming work. Certainly the parallel passage (2 Pet. ii. 1) adds the words "that bought them," which refer to the death of Christ; but in Jude no express reference of this kind can be found. In ver. 17 the apostolical teaching is referred back to Jesus Christ. The apostles are His apostles, and their words appear as an authority for us. In addition to the divine intervening agency of Christ, we have also to remark that of the Holy Spirit. Although in vers. 1 and 25 the intervening agency of Christ in the divine grace is alone spoken of, yet in ver. 20 that of the Holy Ghost also appears, so that in that passage the threefold causality of salvation is comprehended. The subjective Christian life, as self-edification in prayer, is here evidently brought into connection with the Holy Ghost, and is a life in fellowship with Him. In these points all the elements of the Christian consciousness are comprised, although in a didactic point of view they are not so amply developed as even in James' Epistle.

The main idea in Jude's Epistle, and also the motive for his exhortations, is the divine judgment, to which must be added his strictures on those who are liable to it. A parallel to this is to be found in 2 Pet. ii., where degenerate Christians are similarly depicted and threatened with judgment, only they are described as arising in the future (2 Pet. ii. 1–3), whilst in Jude they appear as already existing (ver. 4). Jude writes about these degenerate Christians of his time to those who have remained firm members of Christ's Church, first warning them to be mindful of the divine judgment which the former will surely meet with (with which a description of these ungodly men is combined, vers. 5–19), and then adding an exhortation to the faithful that they should keep themselves in the love of God, etc., and yet help the ungodly as far as possible (vers. 20–23). This judgment is proved by examples drawn from the Old Testament; and the author, in following this course, instead of deriving the idea of judgment from the

¹ The English version follows the *text. recept.*, and adds Θεόν after δεσπότην, which is omitted by the best mss.—TR.

internal nature of Christianity, shows how moderate he is in developing the didactic purport of the latter. In 2 Pet. ii. we find adduced as examples, the angels who had sinned, the flood, and Sodom and Gomorrha; and Jude's Epistle takes the same ground, although independently. The allusion to the judgment on the people of Israel (ver. 5) is peculiar to Jude's Epistle. Jude has to show that even Christians, in spite of the divine grace which has been preached to them, obtained for and assigned to them, will not remain unpunished if sinful apostasy intervene. He therefore appeals to the manifested mercy of the old covenant. The words τὸ δεύτερον τοὺς μὴ πιστεύσαντας ἀπώλεσεν are usually applied to the unbelieving portion of the people, or to the whole generation which was not permitted to enter the promised land. Another interpretation would render the reading Ἰησοῦς instead of Κύριος in some degree explicable. If the Epistle of Jude was written after the destruction of Jerusalem, it would seem curious that he does not mention this particular judgment. Now, if τὸ δεύτερον be referred to this second destruction, it would be an act of the incarnate Christ, and the subject would be chosen in reference to the *Verbum finitum*. On this point cf. Acts vi. 14. But verse 5 can easily be considered as applying only to the Israelites in the wilderness. The second example is the judgment on the angels, which, however, is only as yet begun (ver. 6). The subject may be here the same as in ver. 5, but then the reading Ἰησοῦς would be all the more improbable. The sinful fall of angels generally might be understood here; but still the words ἀπολιπόντας τὸ ἴδιον οἰκητήριον would appear somewhat strange, and Satan's not being mentioned, who is elsewhere specially distinguished, might cause surprise. But it thus becomes the more probable that a particular class of fallen angels is meant. This idea is strengthened by ver. 7, in which it is said that the Sodomites had acted similarly. According to this, the sin of these angels consisted in forsaking the sphere of the spirit-world and intermingling unbecomingly in that of the flesh. The final judgment is not yet passed upon them, but they are even now compelled to remain in a prison of darkness instead of a habitation of light; even as Sodom and Gomorrha, which sinned in like manner, are set forth as an example, and as suffering the vengeance of eternal fire. It cannot be readily shown that these cities had previously shared in any peculiar exercise of God's grace; the

judgment on them is therefore added because their sin resembled the fall of the angels. *Ἐκπορνέειν* is a *πορνέειν* which transgresses all bounds; *έτέρας* is not only forbidden flesh generally,—that which is *not* the *μία σάρξ* of those united in matrimony,—but is also specially *έτέρα σάρξ*, as in the case when the human race degrades itself to bestiality. The self-degradation of the angels to the *σάρξ ἀνθρωπίνη* was something akin to this. From Gen. vi. 2–4, it is presupposed both here and in Jewish tradition—for instance, in the Book of Enoch—that events of this kind occurred in the higher spirit-world. A closer delineation of these degenerate men follows the examples of judgment, in the course of which delineation three other instances are alluded to (ver. 11),—the way of Cain (absence of love), the erring of Balaam (misuse of divine gifts), and the rebellion of Korah (forcible resistance to God's will and institutions). This judgment is now further illustrated by the prophecy of Enoch, which is found in the book of that name which has been discovered. The question arises whether this prophecy is derived from ancient times as the fundamental fact on which the whole Book of Enoch is based, or whether it is quoted from the apocryphal book itself. Of course there is nothing in Jude's Epistle which can confirm the other contents of the Book of Enoch. There was, however, an ancient tradition that Enoch had warned his contemporaries of the divine judgment. The mention of the archangel Michael, whose modesty Jude contrasts with the shameless and arrogant *βλασφημεῖν* of all *δόξαι* on the part of false Christians, refers to another Jewish tradition, which appears to be set forth in the apocryphal *Ascensio Moſis* mentioned by Origen, although an allusion to it is perhaps contained in Deut. xxxiv. 5, 6. This passage, at all events, hints at something extraordinary having taken place as regards the body of Moses. That which the Lord did upon Sinai was not done without the intervention of angels (Gal. iii. 19; Acts vii. 53; Heb. ii. 2); it is therefore likely that the events connected with the body of Moses took place through the same intervention. Satan, as the beginner of sin and prince of this world, has also *τὸ κράτος τοῦ θανάτου* (Heb. ii. 14); and it therefore forms a part of the sentence on account of sin, that the body of the sinner is liable to corruption. To this rule, which was to be broken through by Christ, exceptions to a certain extent appear to have existed, namely, in Moses and Elias,

whom we find in a supernaturally glorified state on the occasion of our Lord's transfiguration. The words which are quoted Jude 9, occur in Zech. iii. 2 in another connection. This passage, at all events, points to the fact that all judgment proceeds from the Lord, and that the higher spirits refer only to His judgment and power.

This teaching as to judgment is a continuation and completion of James' view of Christianity as the perfect law of liberty. Whoever does not respond to the practical requirements of Christianity has, according to James, no part either in justification or salvation. Christianity makes certain demands, but affords to men the life through which these demands may be satisfied; and where this life does not exist, there is no true Christianity. Whoever rejects Christianity, the perfect and beatifying law, becomes liable, according to Jude, to the heaviest judgment, and is twice dead and rooted out. This is the ethico-practical standpoint which is also laid down in James' Epistle. But as the Epistle of Jude contends against the libertinism (traces of which we find in 1 John and Rev. ii. 3), he has to denounce the denial and rejection of the one Ruler and Lord, Jesus Christ. We see from this that didactic and theoretical errors are in question here, and not merely practical corruption. These errors cannot be obviated, except by a development of Christian doctrine as to the person of Christ. Jude, therefore, goes beyond both his own standpoint and that of James' Epistle. All the Christological doctrines which are presupposed in these two epistles were laid down elsewhere and in comparatively much earlier times, viz. by *Peter*, one of the three men who were considered as pillars of the Church.

II. THE APOSTOLICAL TEACHING OF PETER.

§ 62. *Our Authorities for the Petrine Doctrinal System.*

The first Epistle of Peter, which was classed by the ancient Church among the *Homologoumena*, must, from the results of modern criticism, be considered as genuine. Schweigler bases his opinion of its non-genuineness on the idea that the apostolic age was entirely divided into the Pauline and Petrine parties, and that it was not until a later age that the need was felt of uniting the two; and that, in consequence, works of a reconciliatory

character were fathered upon the representatives of the opposite opinions. But this hypothesis of the circumstances of the apostolic age, and the relations of its chief men, is, as we have seen, an erroneous one. And these relations, as we find them set forth in Gal. ii. and the Acts of the Apostles, actually explain those characteristics from which special arguments are derived against this epistle. It certainly contains matter which reminds us of passages in the Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians; and it certainly also testifies that that is the true grace of God in which its readers stand (ch. v. 12); but from this it cannot be justly inferred that this epistle is a forged work, in which an attempt is made to harmonize the Petrine with the Pauline doctrine, and to make Peter testify to the Pauline community that in Paul's teaching they possess the true gospel. The fact of Peter (addressing readers who had received an epistle from Paul) referring to any such epistle,—the fact of an apostle writing to a mixed community, exhorting them to persist in the true grace, and thus working in harmony with another apostle,—these things are not contrary to historical probability; and it is in entire harmony with the events related in Gal. ii. that the apostles should thus agree in Asia Minor, where they both saw and feared enemies of apostolical doctrine common to each. We read in Col. iv. 10 that Paul sent Mark, a former companion of Peter, to the churches of Asia Minor. This leaves all the less cause for surprise that, in consequence of Mark's mission, Peter should have taken the step which he did, perhaps being urged on to it by Paul, through Mark's agency. Why, moreover, should he not notice certain epistles of Paul, which had been sent shortly before to Ephesus and some other churches? This would certainly be more in harmony with the apostolic spirit than the hypothesis of modern criticism, that nothing but schism, wrangling, and controversy existed among the apostles, and that the judicious idea of reconciling the Pauline and Petrine doctrines did not arise until the second century. It is, however, our task to show that the *first Epistle of Peter* sets forth a line of doctrine characteristic of Peter, and does not contain the Pauline teaching in its full peculiarity.

With the *second Epistle of Peter* the case is different. Even in the ancient Church it was looked upon as an *ἀντιλεγόμενον*, and in modern times many have maintained its non-genuineness. It

appears to represent itself with design as a production of Peter, and, with similar design, to clearly state its pacificatory purpose. Added to this, we must take into account certain ideas of an Alexandrine tone, and the apparent dependence on the Epistle of Jude. Looking at all these points, we cannot, in the province of New Testament theology, treat both these epistles in a similar way. But the inducement to consider and compare the doctrinal purport of the second epistle is the more considerable, owing to the latter being so excellent in many respects and quite worthy of the canon.

In addition to the epistles, we have to consider Peter's *discourses*, as recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, chiefly in its first part, when the mother Church at Jerusalem was the scene of the apostolic ministry. In those early days Peter was the spokesman of the apostolic community; and these discourses form, therefore, a part of the historical monuments of the apostolical Church. They are contained in the passages, Acts i. 16-22, ii. 14-39, iii. 12-26, iv. 8-18, v. 29-32, viii. 20-23, x. 34-43, xi. 5-18, xv. 7-11. These discourses form, of course, only secondary sources, being found in a book of the New Testament which is not properly of a didactic character. Without doubt they are not literally reported, but they nevertheless serve as an interesting ground of comparison with the first Epistle of Peter, and the more so, as we cannot fail to recognise a peculiar fidelity in the record, both to the spirit and method of the apostle.

The first epistle is addressed to the Christians in Asia Minor, who are designated as the elect strangers in the *διασπορά* (i. 1, 2), a usual term applied to the scattered Jews; but from ch. ii. 10 we may gather that the Gentile Christians are also included. These are depicted by Peter as grafted on to the ancient people of God. To these Christians generally the apostle writes from afar, from the neighbourhood of Babylon, with the view of confirming their convictions that they are living in God's true community, and thus to guide them aright amid all the ferment of that time. The epistle was written at a date when Christians were subject to persecution (cf. iv. 15, 16).

§ 63. *Character and Arrangement of the Petrine System.*

In the first place, Christianity is the fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy. The chief passage showing this is 1 Pet. i.

10-12. The preamble of Peter's Epistle is an ascription of praise to God for the salvation in Christ, which is a regeneration unto a lively hope, the end of which is the *σωτηρία ψυχῶν*. This *σωτηρία* (or *χάρις*, as depending on the divine grace, and falling to the lot of the Christian, ver. 10), and also the sufferings and consequent glorification of Christ, on which the salvation rests (ver. 11), were the subjects of Old Testament prophecy, just as the fulfilment of the latter is the subject of the gospel teaching (ver. 12); consequently this fulfilment is exactly that which is given in Christianity. But the end and aim of prophecy is reached only in those who share in its fulfilment, and are enabled to compare both together, and to acknowledge, with full conviction, that fulfilment in its true light. The culminating point of this is the salvation which will be revealed in the last time in the impending and complete manifestation of Christ, *τὸ τέλος τῆς πίστεως* (vers. 5, 7, 9, 13). To this hope we are now begotten again through the resurrection of Christ (ver. 3). By means of this regeneration, there is a salvation reserved in heaven, which is the subject of our lively hope, although at present it is but faith and hope amid many kinds of afflictions. But an abiding in this hope will lead to the complete manifestation of God, which is impending; and it is just this salvation, in its completion and whole extent, which is the subject of Old Testament prophecy (ver. 10).

In full harmony with all this are Peter's discourses in the Acts of the Apostles; for in them not only the details, which form the purport of Christianity, are referred back to Old Testament prophecy, but the whole scope of salvation is looked upon as the fulfilment of prophecy (Acts iii. 18-25). The whole of prophecy relates to the restitution of all things; and this is the aim and end of the entire work of redemption, which, having begun with the earthly appearance of Christ, is to be completed at His second appearance, which the apostle makes the culminating point of his epistle.

As a corollary to the preceding, it must be noticed that Peter regards Christians as those in whom the idea of the theocratic people—that which had been predicated of the Old Testament nation—is realized (1 Pet. ii. 5, 9 f., iv. 17). They are the *γένος ἐκλεκτόν* (ii. 9, following Isa. xliii. 21), those chosen from all men to be dedicated to God, the *βασίλειον ἱεράτευμα* (cf. Ex. xix. 6),

an ἔθνος ἅγιον; also a λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν (Mal. iii. 17), applied to the Gentile Christians in the sense of Hos. ii. 23. They are built up on the rejected corner-stone, and are the οἶκος πνευματικός (ii. 5), bringing spiritual offerings, acceptable through the mediation of Christ. For these reasons they are, in an ideal sense, strangers scattered abroad, as living in the midst of an unchristian world. They are, in truth, that which the members of the theocracy under the old covenant were to have been.

This conception of Christianity corresponds with the way in which Peter lays down its chief doctrines, and especially that of the person and work of Christ, which are throughout declared to have been testified to in Old Testament prophecy. In connection with this, we find the various phases of Christ's appearance purposely brought forward with reference to prophecy. Peter, however, chiefly keeps to the historical appearance of Christ, and does not so closely enter into the nature on which it was based, because in the former the tokens which mark the fulfilment of prophecy are principally found.

This view of Christianity, as the fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy, corresponds also with the personal character of Peter, so far as it is known to us. Through his intercourse with Jesus, Peter had been gradually elevated from the Old Testament standpoint to that of the New, and he had lived so much in the contemplation of Christ's historical manifestation, that he could hardly fail to lay a stress upon it. In the next place, his destiny as an apostle was to stand at the head of the twelve, and to be the first to testify for Christ, and also to found the early Church in the midst of the Jewish nation. Amongst this nation must Jesus be preached as the Messiah, in whom Old Testament prophecy is fulfilled, and preached with all the candour, power, and confidence by which Peter had been already distinguished. We must also notice that, as a native of Palestine, Peter was unacquainted with the Greek culture, and, being unaccustomed to associate with Gentiles, although the participation of heathen nations in the Messianic salvation was, by means of prophecy, an idea present to his mind (Acts ii. 39, iii. 25), yet their call, without circumcision and observance of the law, was a thing not clear to him, until he was led thereto by fresh facts (Act x., xi.). But, after the directions which were imparted to him from above, he speedily and completely adopted these views, and, in the face of the strictly

Jewish members of the Church at Jerusalem, spoke the words contained in Acts xi. 1–17, which led to his audience giving glory to God (ver. 18). But, inasmuch as Peter had not previously entertained these views, we perceive that, during his subsequent apostolical ministry, his personal feelings led him to regard the gospel mainly in the aspect of its unity with the old covenant, and as the fulfilment of prophecy.

But in these views of the gospel Peter did not fail in understanding the peculiar nature of Christianity, but (like James) acknowledges the liberating power which distinguishes it from the Old Testament law, and points to the distinction between Christianity and prophecy, as well as to their unity. This distinction consisted, (1) in the idea of the fulfilment of prophecy. That which was a matter of fact in Christianity was not yet realized under the old covenant; indeed, even the presignification by the Holy Spirit through the prophets was only in part clear to them, and was in other parts the subject of seeking and inquiry (1 Pet. i. 10 f.), both as to the date of the fulfilment, and also as to the “manner of the time” (ver. 11), that is, the historical shaping of that which was to occur. There is, therefore, a great distinction between the prophets of the old and the believers of the new covenant, both in point of knowledge, and also, and chiefly, in respect to the *possession of the salvation* which exists only in the new covenant (cf. Matt. xiii. 17, xi. 11; Rom. i. 2 f., 16, iii. 21; 1 Cor. ii. 7; 2 Cor. i. 20; Col. i. 26 f.; Eph. iii. 9). (2) Peter points out that not only salvation in general is the subject of prophecy (1 Pet. i. 10), but also the personal Redeemer as the author or agent of salvation, specifying, indeed, the essential points of His historical appearance (ver. 11); and there thus results a further great distinction between prophecy and its fulfilment, for in the latter the personal appearance of the Saviour is included. Peter, therefore, in his representation of Christianity, sets forth a Christology as the chief subject of Christian teaching,—that is, a teaching both of the person and work of Christ in His historical appearance: how these were in both respects predicted in Old Testament prophecy, but actually appeared in Christianity; and also of the revelation which began with His visible life (1 Pet. i. 20), and will be gloriously perfected in the future (i. 7, 13, iv. 13; cf. Acts iii. 20, 21).

Peter so far agrees with James, he also being inclined to re-

present the *Christian ethical life* as a life proceeding from a divine birth (1 Pet. i. 3, 23-25); but the former apostle differs from the latter, not only in scarcely ever referring to the law, or, at the most, in interweaving its commands with the development of special Christian motives (cf. i. 16 ff.), but also in giving prominence more expressly to the *bringing about of this new life through Christ* (i. 3), especially through His personal appearance. Peter represents Christianity as the fulfilment of prophecy; but James does not mention it, although he speaks of the *ἑσχάτας ἡμέρας* (v. 3), and quotes the prophets as models of patience (v. 10).

Peter, in regarding Christianity as fulfilled prophecy, developes a line of teaching referring partly to salvation, partly to its causality. Our taking so comprehensively general a view of the causality of salvation might appear to be an abstraction very foreign to Peter's ideas. But in the beginning of the epistle he styles the Christians "elect strangers." This implies that they are in possession of salvation. According to ver. 2, they are elect to salvation, and partakers of the same in virtue of the *πρόγνωσις Θεοῦ*, the *ἁγιασμὸς πνεύματος*, and the *ῥαντισμὸς αἵματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*. These three points together evidently form here the causality of salvation, and are intended to describe it exhaustively. Peter feels inwardly compelled, not only to describe salvation, but to represent its entire causality; therefore in his very salutation he brings forward these three points. Consequently our saying that the whole epistle may be divided into the two above-named chief elements is no self-devised scheme, but an arrangement forced upon us by the epistle itself. This division also distinguishes Peter from James; and we have in Peter's Epistle a completion of doctrine and progress in its development. This twofold character pervades, too, the whole epistle. The teaching as to salvation is often interwoven with the doctrine of its causality. Thus in hortatory passages, which refer in the first place to salvation, the author of the epistle often reverts to the causality of salvation, generally to Christ and to historical points in His work of redemption. The practical aim of Peter's Epistle is the cause of his proceeding from the subjective side; and it does not follow from this that the latter takes the lead in his line of thought. On the contrary, we may conclude that the objective side actually prevails in it, from the fact that, in his representation of salvation,

and exhortations to its appropriation, he everywhere reverts to its causality; whereby also the circumstance is explained that in every section of his epistle he again adverts to the Christology.

In the discourses of Peter in the Acts, the preaching of Christ, the Lord and Redeemer, most decidedly takes the foremost place.

§ 64. *Peter's Teaching as to the Cause of Salvation—Of the Person of Christ as the Author of Salvation.*

In his teaching as to the person of Christ, Peter proceeds upon the idea of Christ's historical appearance, for in this alone was prophecy fulfilled. He therefore speaks of Him as *Ἰησοῦς Χριστός* or *ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν* 'I. X. (1 Pet. i. 3). But he also calls Him *Χριστός* alone, inasmuch as He has suffered (iv. 1, iii. 18). Certainly, though, this is done under peculiar circumstances, which should call our attention to the passages relating to them; cf. i. 11, 19, 20. Peter speaks in but a few passages of Christ before His appearance. Once he designates Him as one "fore-ordained before the foundation of the world" (i. 19, 20). This act of Christ's fore-ordination to be the Messiah is independent of the world, and based only on the eternal counsel of God. His appearance is a necessary item in the history. Not only does Peter describe Christian salvation as the subject of prophecy, but he also intimates a relation to Christ in the Spirit of God which actuated that prophecy (1 Pet. i. 11). The *πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ* here is neither the *inspiration of the Messiah*, for *πνεῦμα* is an active principle which "reveals" and "testifies," nor *the Spirit which prophesied of Christ*, because the use of *Χριστοῦ* as *genitivus objecti* in this oft-occurring expression would be very unusual; but this genitive must be interpreted (as Rom. viii. 9; cf. Gal. iv. 6) similarly to the term *πνεῦμα Θεοῦ* (1 Pet. iv. 11), consequently as *the Spirit which Christ has and gives*. Hence result essentially but two interpretations: (1) The Spirit of God, which subsequently in the times of fulfilment was in the revealed Christ, and proceeded from the glorified Christ; (2) The Spirit which always, and in the Old Testament days, was in Christ and proceeded from Him. In the first case, we do not go further than Christ after He had appeared; and His existence before His appearance is only ideal and supposed, as in i. 20, and the relation of Christ to prophecy is also only ideal. In the second case, the Christ not yet appeared is a real existence, and His

relation to the Spirit of prophecy is a real one. It cannot be said that the first explanation is an impossible one. By it Christ would not be really pre-existent; but the divine principle of life which existed in the manifested Christ was operative even before His appearance. It was not yet contained in His personality, being the eternal Spirit of God apart from Christ's person, but yet the same Spirit which subsequently dwelt in it. The second interpretation is certainly easier in a philological point of view, and in one respect involves nothing improbable. The idea of pre-existence was taught not only by John, but also by Paul (1 Cor. x. 4; Col. i. 16 ff.), and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews (i. 2 f.). Jesus also asserted it in His utterances as to Himself. It cannot, therefore, appear strange that Peter, looking as he did upon Christ as being fore-ordained by God before the foundation of the world for a future temporal appearance, should have represented Him as pre-existent with God before this manifestation. One difficulty presents itself,—that in the New Testament the outpouring of the Spirit of Christ is fixed to take place at the time of the fulfilment and not before, indeed after the date of Christ's exaltation. Peter Himself designated the risen Christ as one anointed with the Holy Ghost, and in Acts ii. 32 f. declared that it was the Risen and Exalted One who had received the Holy Ghost to shed it forth upon men. Here, however, he would be made to say of the Christ not yet manifested, that His Spirit had operated in the prophets. We must therefore, at all events, so understand the idea of this relation of the outpouring of His Spirit, that the Spirit of Christ Himself prepared in the prophets that which He completed in believers; in which case it would be *realiter* the Spirit of the pre-existent Christ. Certainly, if Peter looked upon the pre-existence as ideal, the *πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ* would thus not be identical with the *πνεῦμα* which exists in believing Christians. Objectively, indeed, it is the same Spirit of God, but He did not exist in the prophets in the same way as in believing Christians. In Christians He is indwelling; but He only came upon the prophets at times for the purpose of their *προφητεύειν*, and, therefore, in His operation only looked forward to and aimed at Christ, who, as not yet manifested, could not as yet be the basis of the Spirit's agency. From this passage, therefore, we cannot with certainty attribute to Peter the teaching of a real pre-existence. In any case, however, Peter has relegated Christ

out of and beyond any mere temporal contingency. In both the passages quoted, he views Christ before His appearance as one chosen and ordained by God from all eternity, and if not as really pre-existent, at all events as one whose appearance was preceded by an agency of the divine Spirit, which belonged to Him to so great an extent that this Spirit is called "the Spirit of Christ."

In other passages, however, it is always the *manifested* Christ of whom Peter speaks. He was manifested ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν χρόνων (1 Pet. i. 20; cf. Acts ii. 17, iii. 24; Heb. i. 2; Gal. iv. 4; 1 Tim. iii. 16), *i.e.* in the last times, when *that* is fulfilled to which the times preceding only tended; φανερωθῆναι is, therefore, not to be understood here of the future glorious manifestation, as in v. 4. But if Christ's historical appearance in the earthly temporal life is to be viewed as a *being made manifest*, an intimation is thereby given that something entered with Him into this earthly life which previously had not been manifest. In this passage, φανερωθέντος stands face to face with προεγνωσμένου, and would so far retain its sense, even in the consideration of an ideal pre-existence, *i.e.* the pre-ordination in the counsel of God. But προεγνωσμένου is not calculated to negative the real pre-existence, for the word Χριστοῦ involves a destination which even in the real pre-existence is not yet realized, and can only be in virtue of the φανερωθῆναι.

In the person of the manifested Christ, Peter distinguishes σὰρξ and πνεῦμα (1 Pet. iii. 18), although his conception of Christ's nature is always subordinate to that of the conditions attending it. In John and Paul, the σὰρξ of Christ is His human nature (John i. 14; 1 John iv. 2; Rom. i. 3, 4, cf. ix. 5). In Peter, the idea is here not so definitely expressed, and the connection does not suffice for this. But as it is the σὰρξ by means of which Christ suffers death, we must understand by it merely the earthly and material corporeality; cf. the parallel between σὰρξ and σῶμα in respect to His sufferings in ch. iv. 1, ii. 24. What, then, is Peter's idea as to the πνεῦμα here contrasted with the σὰρξ? With respect to this contrast, we must by no means premise that only the σὰρξ, on the one hand, and on the other the πνεῦμα, were present in Christ. The two can never exist together without the intervention of the ψυχή; and the death of the σὰρξ is always its separation from its ψυχή. Peter entirely recognised this idea of the ψυχή in man (1 Pet. i. 9), and in Christ (Acts ii. 27);

but the *πνεῦμα* itself is not to be taken one-sidedly, either as merely human, nor as purely divine, and, in connection with this, *ζωοποιηθῆναι* (ver. 18), neither as merely *remaining alive* (of the human spirit), nor as being resuscitated (through the power of the divine Spirit). As regards the latter idea, the resurrection is not spoken of till ver. 21; but if the resurrection was meant here, we must assume that between vers. 18 and 21 the period before the resurrection is again dealt with, whereby the train of thought would be altogether confused. According to this, the exclusive reference to the Spirit of God is done away with, and also, in truth, the explanation which only discovers various conditions in the two ideas, and not definitions of His nature. Neither can the *ζωοποιηθῆναι* be understood as mere *remaining alive* (of the human spirit), for this would be nothing peculiar to Christ and happening distinctively to Him. Besides, the evident intention is to announce the appearance of something which did not before exist. Thus the *πνεῦμα* is, doubtless, not merely human; but it is a principle which was in Christ in a peculiar way, of a quickening nature, as the *πνεῦμα* in His divine nature generally is. In consequence of His death, this principle is set free and unfettered from the material bodily nature, and, assuming its full privilege, developes in Him the *ζωή*, which was in Him in all fulness. By this (*ἐν ᾧ*, ver. 19), He went to the place where the spirits are kept in the *φυλακή*, and there developed a course of action worthy of Him (cf. Acts ii. 24, iii. 15). It is here Christ's spiritual nature generally, but exercising a function which points to a peculiar dignity and eminence, and to a more than human potency of the *πνεῦμα*. With regard to the human element in the person of Jesus, we must mention that Peter (Acts ii. 30 f.) speaks of Him as a descendant of David according to prophecy, as in the Synop- tists and Rom. i. 3.

To this person of the manifested Christ, even during His earthly life, certain pre-eminent peculiarities are ascribed by Peter. In the latter's discourses in the Acts, we find mentioned not only His Messianic dignity, but also His Messianic power, with which God had anointed Him (Acts x. 38 f., iv. 27, cf. ii. 22). Christ is also called the *ἀρχηγὸς τῆς ζωῆς*, the Prince of Life (Acts iii. 15, v. 31), not as the originator of spiritual life alone, but, on account of the reference to the healing of the man born lame, of bodily life also. It is also implied that He is not

only the Author of life, but also possesses it in His nature: cf. Acts ii. 24, where the internal necessity of His resurrection is stated. This, again, throws a fresh light on the ζωοποιηθεὶς τῷ πνεύματι (1 Pet. iii. 18), showing that the πνεῦμα in Him possessed this power of life. Quite in harmony with this is the peculiar distinction which is given in the epistle to the resurrection. Christians are described as “begotten again” by the resurrection of Christ (i. 3); the deliverance from sin is brought about by it (i. 21), in a way corresponding to the idea of the Prince of life.

Peter’s Epistle also sets forth with special emphasis another side of Christ’s peculiar dignity, namely, His sinlessness (i. 19, ii. 22 f., iii. 18; cf. Acts iii. 14), in reference, indeed, both to its internal relation to the atonement through Him, and to its character as a moral type. In the epistle (i. 19) He is styled, in reference to Isa. liii. 7, and in allusion to the fitness therein implied to be an atoning sacrifice, a “lamb without blemish and without spot” (ἄμωμος and ἄσπιλος). In ch. ii. 22, 23, the reference to Isa. liii. is altogether literal, and the typical example (ver. 21) is joined to the reference to the sufferings of the atonement (ver. 24); so also in ch. iii. 18, where He is merely styled “the just,” in contrast to all men as sinners.

Peter comprehends the condition of Christ’s person (1 Pet. i. 11) in a twofold view,—the sufferings, and the stages of glorification which were to follow.

By so essentially asserting these two main circumstances, the apostle shows that, in the sufferings and death of Christ, he saw nothing incompatible with His sublimity; on the contrary, that he recognised in them a certain spiritual and moral grandeur. Also, in his mention of Christ’s sinlessness, he notices chiefly His conduct in His sufferings. In 1 Pet. ii. 22, i. 19, ii. 24, Acts v. 30, x. 39, the mode of death is pointed out (ἐπὶ ξύλου), because this very kind of death is called in the law *bearing the curse of sin* (Gal. iii. 13). The sufferings of Christ are likewise mentioned in other passages (1 Pet. i. 11, iii. 18, iv. 1, 13, v. 1), and in several passages in the Acts; also “the blood of Christ” is named in 1 Pet. i. 2, 19. These sufferings are expressly described as undeserved (1 Pet. i. 19, iii. 18; Acts iii. 14), and also as fore-ordained by God and predicted by the prophets (Acts iii. 17 f.; 1 Pet. i. 11, ii. 22-25).

Quite as prominently as His sufferings, Peter also sets forth

the resurrection of Christ (i. 3, iii. 21), and says, indeed, that God "raised Him up" (i. 21). In Peter's discourses, the testimony of the resurrection of Christ always forms a chief subject, that event being also described as predicted by the prophets (i. 11; Acts ii. 24-32, with express reference to Ps. xvi. 3 ff., a passage in which Paul also discovers a prophetic allusion to Christ's resurrection: cf. Acts xiii. 35-37; 1 Cor. xv. 4; John xx. 9). The resurrection, therefore, in virtue of Old Testament prophecy, is an essential stage in the Messianic life; but Peter also looks upon it as causatively connected with the special exaltation of Christ (Acts ii. 24, iii. 15). This idea is not expressly brought forward in the epistle, but quite corresponds with the general view taken therein, especially with the passage 1 Pet. iii. 18. The stress which Peter laid on the resurrection is quite clear, apart from the dogmatic and ethical use he makes of it, from the fact that Peter represents it as the special task of the apostles to be witnesses of Christ's resurrection (Acts i. 22; 1 Pet. v. 1).

The ascension of Jesus Christ is a removal to the heavens, to a celestial and glorified life, in which He is ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ Θεοῦ (1 Pet. iii. 22; cf. Acts iii. 21, ii. 33). This expression denotes, in a figure, that Jesus placed Himself in heaven on the right of the divine throne, the centre-point of divine life and power (cf. Heb. xii. 2, viii. 1, i. 3), and, according to 1 Kings ii. 19 and Matt. xx. 21, signifies a participation in the divine honour and dominion (cf. πάντων κύριος, Acts x. 36, ii. 36). By the words πορευθεὶς εἰς οὐρανόν (1 Pet. iii. 22) the ascension would appear to be intimated. Yet the words themselves do not compel us to seek an express reference to the external, perceptible fact, as the same term was used by Peter for the entry into the kingdom of the dead. There is no greater certainty in the ἀνελήφθη (Acts i. 22). The fact itself being presupposed, the idea is very natural that Peter selected these words with allusion to the fact, but the words themselves will not avail as an historical proof. The passage Acts ii. 34-36 is of a similar character, where, from ver. 34, we may see that it is intended to be intimated that Christ ἀνέβη εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς.

His glorious manifestation for the completion of His work is a condition of Christ which will be revealed only in the future (1 Pet. i. 7, 13, v. 4; Acts iii. 20 f.).

The conditions of Christ which we have hitherto considered,

relating to His past, present, and future, are everywhere laid down in the other parts of the New Testament as essential phases in the life and manifestation of Jesus Christ; but there is one circumstance which we find clearly and indubitably brought forward by Peter only.

This is the *presence of Christ in the kingdom of the dead* (1 Pet. iii. 19, iv. 6). It is remarkable that the most complete description of the Messianic conditions is supplied by Peter, who more especially made it his business to represent the Messianic life, appearance, and ministry as the fulfilment of divine prophecy. He speaks not only of a presence of Christ in the kingdom of the dead, but also of some ministry executed there. The interpretation of this passage has been so much discussed and treated of, that it admits of little if any doubt. The passage speaks of something which took place after Christ's death in the flesh. Being in possession of the full energy of life, and only as a *πνεῦμα* set free from the *σάρξ*, He went and preached, not in hell, where the condemned are under judgment, but in Hades, which also has its pains for the wicked (Luke xvi. 23), although not the place either for those condemned or those acquitted and justified in the final judgment. The realm of the dead is, therefore, here intended to mean the region and condition of the departed on whom judgment is impending, who, however, vary much in their moral qualities. Here are those who neither believed in nor complied with God's threats and warnings with regard to the punishment of the Flood (cf. Jude 15, 2 Pet. ii. 9). *Πνεύματα* are departed spirits, who are elsewhere called *ψυχαί* (cf. Rev. vi. 9; Heb. xii. 23; Rev. xxii. 6; Luke xxiv. 37, 39). *Φυλακή* is, in the Syrian translation, expressed by *Sheol*. In Rev. xx. 7 this is the place in which Satan is bound for a thousand years, ere the final judgment is passed upon him. It is, therefore, in this worst case the locality of an intermediate condition before the last judgment. Thus, then, Christ after His death entered the realm of the dead, namely, among the unrighteous, unbelieving, and disobedient, who had been subject to the divine punishment of the Flood.

It is essentially a part of the idea of human death that the soul set free from the body goes to Hades; and thus the resurrection is nothing more than leaving the place. Christ's peculiar power of life had to be put to the test in the entry to Hades. His soul could not be given up to its power, neither could His flesh see

corruption (Acts ii. 27). By the putting off the flesh, the *πνεῦμα* developed the full measure of its divine power of life, and in this power was capable of action. In this doctrine, the reality of the death of Jesus is expressed as opposed to any apparent death, and also the exaltedness of Christ over the *conditio mere humana*, in that He came not under the power of Hades, but, in the divine power of the fulness of life, trod under foot the realm of the dead, not being able to be held by it.

Finally, as regards Peter's general impression as to the person of Christ as a whole, however few may be his direct statements as to the nature of His person, the general view of this apostle embraces some remarkable expressions as to His dignity. We do not, indeed, once find the name *υἱὸς Θεοῦ* either in the first Epistle or in the discourses of Peter. In the latter, however, we have the expression *παῖς Θεοῦ* (Acts iii. 13, 26, iv. 27, 30); but these words ought most probably to be translated *servant of God* in the Old Testament theocratical sense (cf. Matt. xii. 18; Luke i. 54; Acts iv. 25). In full harmony with this is Peter's following Isa. liii. in his description of the sufferings of Christ (1 Pet. ii. 21–25); also, in his first discourses in reference to the utterances as to the *servant of God*, his applying the term *παῖς Θεοῦ* to Jesus quite corresponds with the endeavour to connect Him with Old Testament prophecy. But as we have, both in the discourses of Peter, and also in his epistle, the strongest testimony for the *δόξα* of Christ, we may well assume that the idea of the *υἱὸς Θεοῦ* as applied to Christ was quite familiar to him, looking even at the passages in the gospels in which he is introduced as speaking as an apostle (John vi. 68 f.; Matt. xvi. 16). It is therefore quite in order that in 1 Pet. i. 3 we find the matter put in another way, namely, God being styled *the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*. If God in a pre-eminent sense is the Father of Jesus Christ, and He who has newly begotten us, so that, for Christ's sake and through Christ, He is in a peculiar sense our Father, Christ is also in a peculiar sense the Son of God, so that we, in consequence of His Sonship and faith in Him, are also children of God. In harmony with this, Peter describes God's Spirit the *Spirit of Christ* (1 Pet. i. 11), and also lays down a *threefold causality of salvation* (i. 2). The decisive indication of the dignity may, however, be found in certain passages which express the practical behaviour of believers towards Christ their Lord. In the first place,

the *doxology* (ch. iv. 11), which the most natural construction must apply to Christ, is the same as that applied to God (ch. v. 11). Another passage of the kind is 1 Pet. iii. 15, a citation from Isa. viii. 13, where it is applied to God; but Peter makes Christ the subject, for it is acknowledged by the critics that it should be read *Κύριον Χριστόν*.¹

Thus the relation of believers to Christ is one of religious worship and praise. This is exactly the impression which the Christians had of Jesus Christ from the very beginning, and on account of which they styled Him Lord. The view of the person of Christ pervading this epistle is confirmed by the way in which Peter speaks of the resurrection and exaltation of Christ (*ἀρχηγὸς τῆς ζωῆς*, Acts iii. 15); for *πάντων Κύριος* (Acts x. 36) is perhaps to be taken as masculine, as it is used by Peter in his first address to those who were born Gentiles. Cf. also *Κύριος καὶ Χριστός*, Acts ii. 36.

§ 65. *Peter's Teaching as to the Cause of Salvation—Of the Ministry of Christ as the Author of Salvation.*

The ministry of Jesus is comprehended by Peter in the word *Χριστός*, which is either united with *Ἰησοῦς* or applied to Him without any further name. Therein is implied the whole vocation of Jesus (Acts ii. 36). The aim and end of His ministry is the *σωτηρία* of men (Acts iv. 12; 1 Pet. i. 9 f.). In other passages, Peter calls Him *ἀρχηγὸς τῆς ζωῆς* (Acts iii. 15); *ἀρχηγὸς καὶ σωτὴρ* (Acts v. 31); *ποιμὴν καὶ ἐπίσκοπος ψυχῶν* (1 Pet. ii. 25); and *ἀρχιποιμὴν* (1 Pet. v. 4). Christ is, besides, the stone rejected by men, but made by God the chief corner-stone, which is the living foundation of God's house, the holy people of God, and on which depends the royal and priestly dignity which is possessed by believers, who have it only through Christ (1 Pet. ii. 4–10; cf. Acts iv. 11; Matt. xxi. 42, 44). Elsewhere the royal and priestly dignity is not expressly attributed to Christ, but the predicates seem to intimate them. The details of Christ's ministry are connected with the various conditions of His person.

First, the ministry of Christ in His *earthly condition*.

The *teaching agency* of Christ is not specially set forth in Peter's

¹ The English Translation, following the *text. recept.*, has adopted the other reading, *Κύριον δὲ τὸν Θεόν*; but *Χριστόν* is the reading of all the mss. of highest authority.—Tr.

Epistle, because he does not here, *ex professo*, attempt to represent all the points of His earthly appearance. On the other hand, in the Acts, in Peter's speech to Cornelius the activity of the Lord as a public teacher is made duly prominent (Acts x. 36-38). We do not understand τὸν λόγον as an *acc. absolut.*, but as governed by καταλαμβάνομαι, in ver. 34. At all events, the sense is, that Jesus Christ was God's instrument for preaching peace,—peace with God, and mutual peace among men (cf. Eph. ii. 14). Jesus' miraculous agency is also brought forward (ver. 38) as a result of His Messianic anointing, and as a beneficent course of action, overcoming by God's power the works of Satan; by which action it was manifest that God was with Him. This passage shows us what value Peter laid on the teaching of Christ; and we may also gather the same conclusion from the stress which he lays in the epistle on the *word of Christ*, the *word of God*, and on the *gospel as teaching* (1 Pet. i. 23, 25, ii. 2, 8, iii. 19, iv. 6),—this gospel being indeed the truth which Christians have to obey (1 Pet. i. 22), and also God's word, which exists for ever in distinction from everything carnal (ver. 24 f.). It also contains such a power of life in itself, that it generates in man a new life (ver. 23), being corroborated by its being the ῥῆμα Κυρίου (ver. 25), and is preached in "the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven" (ver. 12).

Peter very decidedly sets forth the fact of *Christ being a model for us*. We have already seen that he premised His sinlessness; but we may also notice that in some passages, especially 1 Pet. ii. 21-23, this sinlessness is linked on to His typical character. Also, in 1 Pet. iii. 18, Christ is looked upon as a pattern, again, in a similar connection. Thus the historical life of Christ on earth is represented as a pattern especially in its sufferings, and as a pattern in peculiar reference to truth, patience, and love of one's enemies.

This leads us on to the *ministry of Christ in His sufferings and death*. The frequent mention of these events proves what a stress Peter laid upon them. We may also gather this from the circumstance that Peter expressly styles himself "a witness of His sufferings," and also from the way in which he sets forth the significance of the sufferings and death of Christ. He appeals to them in every chapter, partly in reference to sanctification, and partly to the patient endurance of undeserved sufferings. A consideration of the details leads us to a twofold power of the sufferings and death of Christ. (1) *The atoning and expiatory power.*

This is pointed out by the passages which describe the death of Christ as a death “for sinners” (iii. 18), or “for us” (iv. 1), or “for you” (ii. 21).¹ In these passages we have every inducement to prefer the interpretation of ὑπέρ as *in the stead of*,—in the first quoted, because the contrast of the δίκαιος ὑπὲρ ἀδίκων is evidently intended, and is brought prominently forward if this interpretation be adopted. Peter elsewhere sets forth the same idea; for in ch. iv. 1, by the addition ὁ παθὼν ἐν σαρκὶ πέπανται ἁμαρτίας, he presupposes that, because Christ has suffered, believers also have suffered. We can therefore only assume that ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν means *in our stead*; cf. 2 Cor. v. 14. And in ch. ii. 21 we must also understand it in the same way, because the same idea, that Christ bore the punishment for our sins, is indubitably expressed, not indeed in the same verse, but in ver. 24, in the same connection. In ch. ii. 24, in the mention of His sinlessness, innocence, and submissive patience (Isa. liii. 9), it is expressly said that Christ bore our sins upon the cross; that He was raised up on the tree, laden with our sins, with the effect that these our sins were put away upon the cross when His body was slain. In the word ἵνα a purpose is indicated which leads us still further, namely, (2) to the *morally purifying power* of the sufferings and death of Christ, most closely united with their atoning power. Peter so deals with the two, that *the atoning power is clearly laid down, and the purifying efficacy is derived from it* (ch. ii. 24): ἀπογένεσθαι = *to be absent, to go away, to die*, and stands here in contrast to ζῆν. The death of Christ is to produce the effect in us of being dead to sin and alive to righteousness. We are not only to be free from punishment, but dead to sin as regards our behaviour in respect to it. We may compare with this passage, ch. iii. 18, ἵνα ἡμῶς προσαγάγῃ τῷ Θεῷ. Προσάγειν is doubtless used for gifts and offerings which are presented to God; but being here applied to men, we may compare Eph. ii. 18, iii. 12. In the first place, an action on the part of Christ is predicated which extends beyond His death. We are brought to God through the Mediator who died for us, inasmuch as He did not remain in death, but is quickened by the Spirit. We are brought to God, (a) by Christ presenting us to God as those whose sins have been atoned for through His death, and therefore freed from the guilt

¹ The English Translation adopts the reading ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν; but ὑμῶν is that of the *Cod. Vat., Alexand., Ephræm., and Sin.*—TR.

of sin; (*b*) as not only free from guilt, but also morally renewed and quickened (ch. ii. 24), made morally whole, and now alive always to righteousness and purified. But all this is nothing but the result of Christ having suffered for sin in our stead. Similarly in ch. iv. 1, the believer is he who has suffered in Christ, and naturally, by virtue of his faith, is consciously certain and mindful of it; and this has the psychologico-moral effect of operating a cessation of sinning in him.

In other passages *the purifying power of Christ's death is brought forward by itself*, and the *atoning power* is only intimated by the mode of expression as something presupposed (ch. i. 2, 18, 19). The exhortation to a holy fear before God (ver. 17) is based by the apostle, not only on his reminding them of the father-like God on whom Christians call, but also (ver. 18 f.) on the redemption through Christ. *Λυτροῦν* is equivalent to *releasing by a ransom* (*ἀπολυτροῦν*, Col. i. 14; *ἐξαγοράζειν*, Gal. iii. 13); *ἀναστροφὴ* is the whole moral conduct, which is styled vain and empty, because it is both superficial and without continuance, and also inoperative,—that is, deficient in the effect intended. Following the passage in Isa. liii. 7, allusion to which may be so often detected in Peter's Epistle, Christ is a Lamb,—a term which had been applied to Christ by John the Baptist, and likewise by Philip (Acts viii. 32), and in many passages of the Apocalypse. As all beasts for sacrifice must be without blemish and spot, Christ, as the offered One, is here described as *ἄμωμος καὶ ἄσπιλος* (cf. Heb. ix. 14). It is clear, from the words *τιμίῳ αἵματι*, that His death is spoken of. The effect of the shedding of this blood is now described as the ransoming of believers from their vain conversation. The morally purifying power of the death of Christ is, in the first place, pointed out; but its sacrificial action is also alluded to,—the blood of the victim, as the seat of life, being that which is determined by God as the ransom and expiation (Lev. xvii. 11, 14). The setting free from the "vain conversation" presupposes the atonement. The passage, ch. i. 2, *εἰς ὑπακοὴν καὶ ῥαντισμὸν αἵματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, is to be similarly explained. According to the ritual of the Old Testament (Ex. xxiv. 6-8; Lev. xvi. 14-19; Heb. ix. 13 ff., 19), part of the blood of the victim was sprinkled on the holy things,—an usage which was based upon the idea that, by the sins of the nation and individuals, the divine sanctuary itself was contami-

nated, and that the pure sacrificial blood thus purified it (Heb. ix. 21, 23). A part of the blood was also sprinkled on the congregation (Heb. x. 22), so that those stained by sin are cleansed. Not only is their guilt covered, but the impurity of sin itself, so far as it adheres to them, is removed. Christians are the "elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Christ," so that through the power of the atoning death of Christ they are morally purified. But the continuous process of moral purification presupposes an action which extends beyond the death of Christ (ver. 21 f.).

In Peter's discourses in the Acts of the Apostles, the sufferings of Christ are not so specially entered into, because, perhaps, it was more judicious to enlarge upon the proposition, (1) that the sufferings and death of Christ depended on an eternal, divine counsel (Acts ii. 23, iv. 28); and that (2) it was therefore a subject of divine prophecy (Acts iii. 17 f.).

The *agency of Christ in the realm of the dead* consists, according to 1 Pet. iii. 19, iv. 6, in the preaching of the salvation which is based upon the person of Christ, and especially on His death for men. Neither Noah nor the apostolic circle, but Christ, forms the subject to *ἐκήρυξεν*; and it is likewise quite clear to whom this preaching applied,—to the spirits *ἐν φυλακῇ*, the *νεκροῖς*, not indeed in their lifetime, but in Hades. The question now arises, whether it was the dead in general, or only a portion of them? In ch. iv. 6 no article is prefixed to *νεκροῖς*; but this is no proof against the universality of the expression. From ch. iii. 19 f., it is at all events certain that Christ preached to the unbelieving contemporaries of Noah. But the apostle has doubtless mentioned this class by way of example, because they appeared to him as peculiarly guilty (not as peculiarly excusable, because they might have been seduced by wicked spirits). They are described as a generation which, in spite of long-suffering and all God's threatenings (ch. iii. 20), persevered in their unbelief. This is in conformity with the description of them (Gen. vi. 11–13), and with the extraordinary character of the punishment that followed (1 Pet. iii. 20). The Jews looked upon the *generatio diluvii* as most wicked, and ascribed to them no share in the Messianic salvation. This generation, therefore, is brought forward with the view of confirming the idea that it is better for man to

suffer innocently (ver. 17). This generation, suffering on account of their evil deeds, certainly forms a contrast with the undeserved sufferings of Christ. Another reason which led Peter to speak of them is, that he desired to place the punishment of the Flood in juxtaposition with the holy flood of baptism (ver. 20 f.). If, however, salvation was preached to this generation, this preaching must have availed for others who were less guilty. It is the class on whom the first judgment fell, the type of the judgment which is to come. The question now arises, what aim, in Peter's idea, this preaching in the realm of the dead had in view? In ch. iii. 19 ἐκήρυξεν is simply specified; but, because nothing more is added, we must here presuppose the aim expressed elsewhere. This is confirmed in ch. iv. 6. There can be no doubt that the proposition ἵνα κριθῶσι μὲν κατὰ ἀνθρώπους σαρκὶ involves difficulties in the interpretation. One explanation is that κριθῶσι is only grammatically, but not logically, dependent on ἵνα . . . κριθέντες, so that it would mean, "that they, being humanly judged in the flesh, may yet live according to the spirit." Nevertheless the construction is difficult which makes κριθῶσι lose all its logical reference to ἵνα, and also the circumstance that the proposition thus loses its reference to Christ's future judgment, and merely retains that to the judgment which had already taken place in the flesh, although ver. 6 appears to stand in immediate connection with ver. 5, in which the account to be given before the Judge of quick and dead is spoken of. The second explanation endeavours to lessen this difficulty. It allows to κριθῶσι a logical relation to ἵνα, and understands κριθῆναι not as *to be condemned and punished*, but as *to be judged*, as in ver. 5. Σαρκὶ is thus referred to the earthly life: "so that they, as all men, may be judged in respect to their earthly life, but live according to God in the spirit." This idea of σὰρξ is, of course, not without difficulty, because it affords no precise contrast to the πνεῦμα, although it is, at all events, to be preferred to the impossible conception of σὰρξ as the propensity to sin. Especially, however, the judgment must not be looked upon as one purely future, and not yet begun; in any case, corruption and the imprisonment in Hades form a part of it. We must accept it in all its fulness, as beginning in the earthly life, being increased in death, and arriving at a complete consummation in the general judgment. Those in the realm of the dead, to whom the preach-

ing of salvation came, had been subject to a judgment, but it had not yet come to an end. Yet they were ἐν φυλακῇ, and were kept for the final judgment; but this latter might turn to their advantage. This is evidently the sense of this passage, according to which the completion of judgment on them is teleologically included in the divine counsel of salvation, and for their benefit. Thus σὰρξ and πνεῦμα appear to point to a contrast between different spheres of life: cf. 1 Cor. v. 5. It must be, at all events, beyond doubt that the divine purpose in preaching in the realm of the dead was a beneficial one, and that they to whose lot it fell were intended to attain true life, in conformity with God's counsel and preparation. But whether this divine purpose of all preaching of the gospel was actually attained in the case of these dead men, and of all of them, is truly another question. This doctrine gives to the appearance of Christ an entirely universal reference to humanity, not merely to contemporaries and those coming after, but also to those gone before. And this reference applies not only to the judgment on quick and dead, but also to the preaching of salvation, so that those departed before the appearance of Christ do not meet with a final decision of their lot without having the salvation in Christ previously offered them. The way is thus smoothed for the recognition of the idea that the world of men after Christ—those, at least, who have not been brought into outward contact with any temporal preaching of salvation—may become the subjects of a similar course of action after their deaths. The whole account of Christ's agency in the realm of the dead is not, however, exhausted in the statement of Peter, which, with the exception of Acts ii. 27, 31, has but one (if any) parallel in the New Testament, viz. the mention of the καταχθόνιοι (Phil. ii. 10); for the passage Eph. iv. 9 must be understood of His humiliation in life. Not only is salvation preached in the invisible world, but the power of darkness is there essentially broken down. We may compare, on this point, Col. ii. 15, which must be looked at in connection with Peter's statement. The latter, however, does not mention this further result.

We now come to *Christ's agency in His exalted condition.*

That Christ's agency may be imagined as continuous in His glorified state, follows from Peter's image in describing Him as being at the right hand of God (ch. iii. 22); for this denotes His participation in the divine glory, not only in the divine blessed-

ness, but also in the divine agency, which embraces the whole world, and employs the highest powers as its instruments. Again, Peter specially attributes to the exalted Christ the *communication of the Holy Spirit* to the apostles and other believers (Acts ii. 33), which presupposes that He had received from the Father that which He promised to His disciples, and also that He had personally appropriated it. In 1 Pet. i. 12 it is only generally stated that the Holy Ghost had been sent from heaven on the apostles; but in ver. 11 the Spirit which wrought in the prophets is called the "Spirit of Christ." How much more must the author have looked upon the Spirit which came on the apostles and believers as the Spirit which Christ had and gave! These passages, and those in the Acts, mutually supplement one another. Christ, as the ἀρχηγὸς τῆς ζωῆς, is so eminently in possession of the full power of divine life, that He approves Himself to men as He who gives life. Exalted to the heavens, He sheds forth in the power of His name not only the virtue of bodily life, such as miraculous healings, soundness, etc. (Acts iii. 16), under the condition of faith, but, in consequence of His resurrection, men are spiritually quickened by regeneration to a living hope (1 Pet. i. 3), and, through Christ's resurrection and ascension, baptism receives its cleansing power. By Him alone can man be saved (Acts iv. 12). Finally, the exalted Christ is the continual Shepherd and Bishop of souls (1 Pet. ii. 25), and the living corner-stone on which God's spiritual house is built (ch. ii. 4-10; Acts iv. 11 f.), by the agency of *His word* which brings about the divine power of Christ's salvation,—the word of truth (1 Pet. i. 22), the word of life (ver. 24).

But this continued agency of the exalted Christ, having as its aim the salvation of men, finds at last its culminating point in which all is perfected. This is the full manifestation of the exalted Christ, the ἀποκάλυψις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (1 Pet. i. 7, 13), or the φανερωθῆναι (ch. v. 4). The course of development of Christians and men generally, and also of Christ's kingdom, will be once for all closed in the last judgment which is to be passed on all mankind, the quick and the dead (Acts x. 42; 1 Pet. iv. 5). As Christ preached the gospel in the realm of the dead, so will He also judge the dead as well as the living. This perfected manifestation of Christ brings to believers the consummation of their salvation, the perfect σωτηρία, as the τέλος τῆς πίστεως (ch. i. 9).

Although, therefore, Peter's view of Christianity is that of

fulfilled prophecy, the realization of this prophecy is not yet a complete one; but yet, that which is still impending, the *καιροὶ ἀναψύξεως*, or the *ἀποκατάστασις πάντων*, ὧν ἐλάλησεν ὁ Θεός (Acts iii. 19, 21), is not the effect of any new principle, but the operation of Christ Himself, who, since His exaltation, has worked, and is still working among men. We must, however, not fail to remark that, although the judgment is expressly referred to Christ, still in 1 Pet. i. 17 God the Father is looked upon as the Judge. We also notice this in James and in other more developed systems of doctrine. Christ, in His unity with God the Father, must be here understood.

§ 66. *Peter's Teaching as to the Cause of Salvation—Of God the Father, and the Holy Spirit.*

The biblical doctrine of God is modified in certain important points by the doctrine of salvation and of Christ, and the more so the greater the development which is given to the peculiar details of Christianity. We see this in Peter's teaching as to God.

Peter, of course, puts forward a theory as to God generally. God is the Creator of man (1 Pet. iv. 19), to whom "as to a faithful Creator," who maintains His creative love, those who suffer according to His will may commit their souls. He is, therefore, the God who careth for us (ch. v. 7), on whom we must cast all our care (cf. Ps. lv. 22 in LXX.). He is also the Judge who judges impartially every man's work (ch. i. 17). He is the Almighty, under whose powerful hand we have to humble ourselves (ch. v. 6); the Omniscient, who knoweth the heart (Acts xv. 8); the Holy, who has pleasure in the righteous, but is displeased with the wicked (1 Pet. iii. 12), and desires that men should be holy as He is holy (ch. i. 15 f.). But even in these passages a reference to the person and work of Christ is not entirely wanting. God is styled "the faithful Creator" in respect to the house of God, the community of believers who suffer for Christ's sake (ch. iv. 17). He is the Almighty God who cares for *Christians*, gives grace to the humble, and raises them up in His own good time; He is the Judge on whom Christians, for Christ's sake, call as Father (ch. i. 17); the Holy One, who has called Christians to salvation (ch. i. 15); the Searcher of hearts, who communicated the Holy Spirit both to Gentiles and Jews who believed in Christ (Acts xv. 8).

These references are, however, rendered much more significant by the way in which Peter, in numerous passages, expressly sets forth the relation of God to the person and work of Christ. This relation Peter makes partly *objective* and partly *subjective* in its nature. *Objectively*, God is a God of "abundant mercy" (ch. i. 3), the "God of all grace" (ch. v. 10). God is also the Father of Jesus Christ (ch. i. 3), and therefore, generally, the Father (ch. i. 2) of those elect from everlasting. It is He who has fore-ordained Christ from all eternity (ch. i. 20), and has raised up and exalted Him (ver. 21), making Him the chief corner-stone in Zion (ii. 4, 6), —*i.e.* the foundation of a new theocratic edifice. God is, further, through Christ, the Father of believers (ch. i. 17), who hath before chosen them (ch. i. 2) and called them (ch. i. 15, ii. 9) to an eternal glory in Christ (ch. v. 10), begetting them again to a lively hope through Christ's resurrection (ch. i. 3). He it is who perfects, strengthens, and establishes believers (ch. v. 10), and by His power they are preserved unto salvation (ch. i. 5). It is God who is to be glorified in Christ through all ages (ch. iv. 11). Thus God is placed in essential relation to Christ, to believers, and to Christ's work. But God's relation to Christ and His work must also be considered in its *subjective* aspect. Through Christ we have faith in God, who has raised up and glorified Christ, so that God is the subject of our confidence and hope (ch. i. 21); and it was the aim of His atoning death to bring us to God (ch. iii. 18).

Peter's teaching as to the Holy Spirit is of a similar character in its reference to Christ. He calls Him the *πνεῦμα ἅγιον* (1 Pet. i. 12; Acts v. 3), *πνεῦμα Θεοῦ* (1 Pet. iv. 14), and also *πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ* (1 Pet. i. 11). The expression *πνεῦμα κυρίου* (Acts v. 9) is not to be understood as referring to Christ. In a few passages the word *πνεῦμα* is used without qualification. From Acts v. 4, 3, 9, we see that this Spirit is one with God. Ananias, in lying to the Holy Ghost, had lied to God. From 1 Pet. i. 2 it is clear that the Spirit works in men that which is desired by God. But this Spirit of God is placed in essential relation to the person and work of Christ. His communication to men is brought about by the glorified Christ (Acts ii. 33), not only to the apostles as the first preachers of the gospel (1 Pet. i. 12), but also to all believers in Christ (Acts ii. 38, x. 47, xi. 15, xv. 8 f.), so that He "rests" upon these believers (1 Pet. iv. 14), and, remaining in

union with them, is the principle of their sanctification and purification (ch. i. 2, 22), and raises them superior to the world (ch. iv. 14), being evil spoken of by the latter, but glorified by believers. Although reproached for the name of Christ, they are blessed, because the Spirit rests upon them. This Spirit is so eminently the Spirit of Christ, that He is so called by Peter, as operating in the Old Testament prophets (ch. i. 11). The community of believers is styled *οἶκος τοῦ Θεοῦ* (ch. iv. 17), and *οἶκος πνευματικός* (ch. ii. 5).

Peter also expressly defines *the divine causality of salvation as being of a threefold character*. This he does, indeed, in one passage, combining the three together (ch. i. 2),—the Father, the Spirit, and Jesus Christ. The Father is God; the Spirit, however, in which we are sanctified, is here merely a divine principle; and Christ, whose the Spirit is, and through whom it is shed forth upon believers, is the Christ whose Father is God, and through whom God receives His full glorification (ch. iv. 11). In ch. i. 2 it is expressed that the *πρόγνωσις* of God is realized only in the Holy Spirit, and has its aim in the continuous purification through Christ. This combination made by an apostle, especially by Peter, need cause no surprise, as Christ's command to baptize (Matt. xxviii. 19) presents a similar combination as the great foundation of Christian doctrine.

We may notice in James, that his teaching as to God is little influenced by his Christology. It must, of course, be the case that, in any representation of doctrine which gives the essential details of Christianity, the idea of God must be of an essentially Christian character. We have found this to be so; for even in James the idea of God the Father is of one who communicates Himself without reserve to man with His perfect gifts, and regenerates them anew through the word of truth; but at this very general Christian modification of the conception of God, James stops short. Peter, on the contrary, gives a special development to the entire scope of the Christian idea of God. Through his position as the first preacher of the gospel and the founder of the Church, and also by his previous proximity to our Lord, he was led to preach Christ as the Son of the living God (Matt. xvi. 16), who had the words of eternal life (John vi. 68). Peter, therefore, has taught abundantly about Christ; and as, in his intercourse with Him, a new light had broken upon him as to God the

Father of Christ, he does not fail to set forth the relation of Christ to the Father, of the Father to Christ, of Christ to the Spirit, and of the Spirit to Christ, but copiously enlarges upon them, as was practically required. As regards the subjective relation of God to Christ, Peter teaches that we attain faith in God through Christ, and that we become united to God also through Christ; and in these propositions we recognise a fundamental point in the more developed doctrine of God, as shown in the New Testament. We see, therefore, that Peter's Christology agrees essentially with that of Paul and James, and that the former has adopted as copiously as any one the Messianic appearance of Jesus Christ (not merely in his first preaching, but also in his epistles, in which he addresses long existing churches), so that these facts of Jesus Christ's appearance are worked up into one with the teaching as to God. But we also have to remark that the Petrine Christology chiefly dwells in the *manifested* Christ, including the actual glorification of Christ, as beginning in the realm of the dead, and continued and completed in the resurrection and exaltation. Peter's Christological teaching as to Christ before His earthly manifestation, is, on the other hand, more limited; but we may notice what direction his teaching would take on that head if he had entered on the point, for his practical impression of the person of Christ is that of His adoration. What is said of Christ's ministry is in harmony with this. The action, the principle, and the causality which operated in Christ, were of no creature-like character. The unique nature of Christ, as regards the whole world and all mankind, is brought forward; but a full development as to the nature of the person of Christ, as based on the actual details of His appearance and manifestation, is not given by Peter, although an approach to the more developed ideas of Paul and John may be noticed in his teaching.

§ 67. *Peter's Teaching as to Salvation.*

Sin itself, as causing the need for salvation, is not separately dealt with by Peter; but, in his desire to set forth salvation to his readers, and to exhort them to accept and hold fast to it, he speaks of the need for salvation, and the sin which by it is to be put away and cleansed. Peter's teaching as to sin does not, therefore, present much that is peculiar, and his idea of it is derived from the Old Testament. We find, nevertheless, in his

incidental treatment of sin, an unmistakeable many-sidedness, although the final root of sin is not, *ex professo*, gone back to.

Sin, *subjectively considered*, as *individual sin*, is called *ἁμαρτία*, and also as sin generally (ch. iv. 1); and single sins, external or internal, are styled in the plural *ἁμαρτίαι* (ch. ii. 24, iii. 18, iv. 8). This sin is, in the first place, very distinctly denoted as *inward sin*. Sinful desires are *ἐπιθυμίαι* (ch. i. 14), and in their manifold forms *ἀνθρώπων ἐπιθυμίαι* (ch. iv. 2), in contrast to the pure and holy will of God, who desires that we shall be holy too (ch. i. 15 f.). Thus the *ἐπιθυμίαι* are selfish and worldly, and are in part *σαρκικαὶ ἐπιθυμίαι*, in which expression the *σὰρξ* is not to be taken in the Pauline sense, but, as always in Peter, in a corporeal sense. Hence the “fleshly lusts” (ch. ii. 11) which war against the *soul* (*ψυχὴ*), in opposition to all that is higher and more honourable in man (for *ψυχὴ* is a general idea, which embraces both the higher and lower life of the soul; here the higher side is intended, cf. Jas. iv. 1). Sin becomes outward in the *ἀναστροφή*, and tends to “vain conversation” (ch. i. 18). This “conversation” is also called the *ἀνθρώπων ἐπιθυμίαις βιώσαι*, or *πορεύεσθαι ἐν ἀσελγείαις*, etc. (ch. iv. 2). Peter mentions various branches of sin,—some grossly sensual excesses, which are attributed to the pre-Christian state of those who were once heathen (iv. 3), and other manifold sins against our fellow-men (ch. iv. 15, ii. 1, iii. 9 f.). The general expression is, however, *κακὰ ποιεῖν* (ch. iii. 12); and, in harmony with this, *κακία* (ch. ii. 1), which is probably to be understood, not as a special kind, but as the idea of a species of sin. Hence, those who give the dominion to sin in their inner and outer life are called *κακοποιοὶ* (ch. ii. 12, 14), also *ἀσεβεῖς καὶ ἁμαρτωλοὶ* (ch. iv. 18). Peter’s point of view tends, therefore, to a collective life of sin. This view results from the biblical, and especially the New Testament standpoint, sin being placed in juxtaposition with the divine will and the reaction of the divine life and grace. Thus all that is sinful falls into one category. Mankind generally, in the eyes of the gracious God, needs His grace; and salvation in the same way as sin is looked upon as common to all. We have already seen that Peter’s representation of Christ’s manifestation applied it to past generations, as well as to those present and to come. And in his epistle, addressing readers most of whom had previously been heathen, and also in the Acts of the Apostles,

speaking to a population which, although living in the midst of Judaism, needed redemption, he looked upon sin and the need for salvation as common to all, so that "the vain conversation" (1 Pet. i. 18) is described as *πατροπαράδοτος*. They were as if "sheep going astray" without a shepherd (ch. ii. 25), which, in the prophet's sense, means that every sinner followed his own course. But as "every man's own way" leads far from the way of salvation, so all these "ways" were intertwined together. As heathens, these Christians had wrought *τὸ θέλημα τῶν ἐθνῶν* (ch. iv. 3), which are sensual excesses, which in ver. 3 are mentioned by name, in conjunction with the abominable idolatry which stands in opposition to all that is right. It is an *ἀνάχυσις τῆς ἀσωτίας*, which certainly stands in total contrast to the Christian life (ver. 4). This is the heathen form of fellowship in sin, which, however, in another aspect, is called *ἄγνοια* (ch. i. 14), as contrasted with the knowledge of the truth existing under the gospel. The pre-Christian state of the Jews is also described as *ἄγνοια* (Acts iii. 17), inasmuch as they were deficient in the evangelical knowledge of Christ and His salvation. Peter specially speaks of one of the forms of sinful community of living as shown in the *ἀπειθεῖν, προσκόπτειν τῷ λόγῳ*, when the gospel is preached (1 Pet. ii. 7, iv. 17). This want of faith is directly influenced by Satan (ch. v. 8), who, as *ἀντιδικὸς* to believers, "walketh about as a roaring lion seeking whom he may devour." Consequently not only those who have not yet become Christians are kept back from faith in the preaching of the word, but those who have already become believers are, where it is possible, made a prey, not only by means of craft (as of the serpent), but also by means of dread of the persecutions which Christians have to suffer in the world (ch. v. 9). The "world" is meant as a comprehensive expression for the community of sinful livers. To the *κόσμος* is opposed *ἡ ἀδελφότης ἡμῶν*, the fellowship of Christians, which, however, outwardly exists in connection with the world.

Sin *objectively* considered, that is, as regards God, is a relation of *opposition to the divine will* (1 Pet. iv. 2; on which account sin, being an accountable action on man's part, leads to punishment from God (ver. 17), namely, the judgment which must begin at God's house, inasmuch as sin is not altogether extirpated even there, but must devolve in its fullest measure on the impenitent sinner (ver. 18). From the extraordinary stress which

Peter, in his teaching as to salvation, lays on the atoning death of Christ, we may see how prominently this liability to punishment, which depends on the accountability for sin, is brought forward in his epistle. But, although sin is imputable and unbiassed opposition to the will of the holy and just God (ch. i. 16 f.), and therefore brings down God's judgment, it is not on this account *independent of the divine will*: it cannot frustrate God's counsel, but indirectly finds a place in it; so that those who give themselves up to sin, against their better knowledge and conscience, are destined to find in the gospel preached to them, and the Lord Himself, a "stone of stumbling" and "rock of offence" (ch. ii. 7).

Peter's teaching as to sin agrees essentially with that of James, inasmuch as the latter confines himself to actual sin; but James more brings forward the inner aspect of it and the sinful desires, whilst in Peter the community of sinful living is more prominently displayed in its relation to God. On the other hand, we must take a prospective glance at Paul's teaching, who goes an actual step further, and refers sinful desires to the propensity from which they all flow, and traces back the sin, which Peter calls *πατροπαράδοτος*, to its connection with the first man. With regard to the first point, however, Peter gives a hint (1 Pet. i. 22-24). Regeneration is here referred to a need inherent in man, who is *σάρξ*, and therefore without stability. That which is to abide in man, and is therefore of true value before God, cannot proceed from humanity alone. A divine principle must intervene, and regeneration is conditional on the word of God.

We cannot fail to detect a difference between the discourses of Peter and his first Epistle, in respect to the *appropriation of, or conditions for, salvation*. In his discourses, Peter had to do with men to whom salvation was then first preached, and he was consequently compelled to summon them to fulfil the first conditions of that salvation. In the epistle, however, although these conditions might be alluded to, they were not brought forward *ex professo*, or so fully laid down. In the Acts of the Apostles, Peter brings forward, as the conditions of salvation, *repentance, faith, and baptism*; in the first place, repentance and baptism (Acts ii. 38). Baptism is the outward proof or confirmation of repentance; and in the latter, as in the baptismal act spiritually embraced, faith in Jesus Christ as the Redeemer from sin is also

included. In other passages, *μετανοεῖν* alone is brought forward, baptism being presupposed, and *ἐπιστρέφειν* (moral conversion) and *ἄφεσις ἁμαρτιῶν* united with it (Acts iii. 19, 26, v. 31). Faith alone is specified (Acts x. 43, xi. 17, xv. 9, 11),—that is, faith in Jesus Christ. But, that a fundamental change of mind was combined with it, may be gathered from ch. xv. 9 (purifying the heart); and that it was accompanied by baptism is also clear from Acts x. In Peter's first Epistle the first entry into a state of salvation is not so directly dealt with; but faith is throughout asserted to be the subjective condition for salvation,—faith in Jesus Christ (ch. i. 5–9, ii. 6–8), and, through Him, in God the Father (ch. i. 21). In this Peter comprehends the whole of the conditions for salvation, making this faith not merely the commencement of all salvation, but also the continued requisite for our future consummation (ch. i. 5, 9), and therefore the groundwork of the whole Christian life (ver. 7). It need not, therefore, be a cause for surprise that *μετάνοια* is not spoken of in the epistle, for everything is included in faith. But baptism is expressly mentioned (ch. iii. 21). In the Acts it is called baptism in the name of Jesus Christ, and is connected with the forgiveness of sins and the reception of the Holy Ghost. Consequently, through baptism the penitent and believing catechumen received negatively forgiveness of sins, and the Holy Ghost positively; in which are contained both the consciousness of divine mercy, and also the power for all that is good. The passage in the epistle quoted above forms a part of the remarkable section in which the apostle traces the progress of the Lord, from His sufferings to His seat on the right hand of God, and also connects the saving through baptism with the judgment of the flood. The flood is described as a baptism, of which Christian baptism is the antitype. But the water of the flood was not that which saved. Noah and his family were saved by means of the ark, the water being the *conditio sine qua non*, without which this saving could not have taken place. The saving through the water of the flood is a baptism, just as the passage through the Red Sea, according to Paul (1 Cor. x. 2). The passage of Noah and his family through the water was a saving dedication of them, both as a sign of the divine favour, and also as an obligatory engagement to the divine service. Peter compares these two baptisms, inasmuch as the baptismal act is a spiritual and not a

bodily purification. The positive contrast to bodily purification is expressed by Peter in the *συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς ἐπερώτημα εἰς Θεόν*. The flesh is contrasted with the "good conscience," the *σαρκὸς ἀπόθεσις ῥύπου* with the *ἐπερώτημα εἰς Θεόν*. *Δι' ἀναστάσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* must be referred to the whole proposition. We must here go back to ch. i. 21. By the belief in Christ's resurrection our faith and our hope rest on God; for, through the resurrection, and the atoning death of Christ which preceded it, we are raised and entitled to a confident trust in God, and by means of baptism we appropriate to ourselves the effects of the quickening power of the risen and ascended Christ. From what has gone before, Peter's idea of baptism is that of an efficacious agency in the work of redemption, and that, indeed, in a twofold relation, which includes the *συνείδησις ἀγαθή*,—a conscience pure from reproach and the consciousness of guilt, but, from this very reason, a conscience which is sincere and determined to what is right.

Peter, in setting forth baptism and faith as the conditions of salvation, gives no intimation whatever in his epistle that an *obedience to the Mosaical law* is to be looked upon as forming any portion of the conditions necessary to salvation. On the contrary, everything is made to rest on faith in Christ and baptism; and Christians are described as *ἐλεύθεροι* (ch. ii. 16, cf. i. 17),—a predicate which seems to point to freedom from the Mosaical law, especially with the warning added. In the Acts of the Apostles Peter decidedly expresses his opinion against the observance of the Mosaical law as being a condition requisite for salvation.

Salvation, as appropriated by man, is looked upon by Peter as partly individual, partly general.

Salvation, individually considered, is the *subicctive forgiveness of sin*, *ἄφεσις ἁμαρτιῶν*. In the discourses in the Acts, this is promised to those who are not as yet believers under the conditions which have been already stated (Acts ii. 38, v. 31, x. 43). It is a removal of the guilt of sin, and also of the consciousness of guilt. In Acts iii. 19 this is called *ἐξαλειφθῆναι τὰς ἁμαρτίας*. In the epistle, the forgiveness of sins is throughout presupposed wherever the atoning death of Christ is mentioned as applied to the readers, *i.e.* as the impulse for a death to sin (1 Pet. ii. 24, iii. 18, iv. 1). The passage ch. iv. 8 is interpreted by many, that whoever has brotherly love or charity is thereby also in possession

of the forgiveness of sins, however numerous they may be; but the meaning might also be, that this love covers and hides the sins of fellow-men. Certainly the presence of forgiving love indirectly presupposes that we have ourselves experienced forgiveness on the part of God. The subjective consideration of salvation points out also a *new moral life* in it. This is based on being *divinely born again* by means of the divine word (i. 23, ii. 2, 1, 3). The author of this new birth is God (ch. i. 3), in virtue of His redeeming mercy. More closely considered, this regeneration is effected by the divine *πνεῦμα* (ch. i. 2). The life of him that is born again is, according to ch. ii. 2, a weak one, which must be developed and strengthened. If this progress is the work of the Holy Spirit (ch. i. 22), He must also be the author of the beginning. The Spirit is also to be understood by the seed, the *σπορά ἀφθαρτος* (ver. 23). The word of God is therefore the intervening agent; and the "seed" is something different from this, which can be nothing else than the divine Spirit. The word of God is described as living and abiding (cf. ver. 25), and, following Isa. xl. 6-8, in contrast to the frailty of man and all natural productions. This word is not, indeed, the *λόγος Θεός* of John, but the word preached by the apostles (ver. 25). It receives the attributes *living* and *abiding*, inasmuch as it is gospel truth and the word of salvation (vers. 22, 25, 12); also because it is not only the word of God, but also has Christ as its subject (cf. 1 Cor. i. 24), and hence the Spirit proceeding from Christ is efficacious in it. But we do not identify Christ with the *ῥῆμα*. This regeneration is, according to Peter, an *ἁγιασμὸς πνεύματος* (ch. i. 2). This, however, does not include merely the regeneration effected, but also a continuous and growing new moral life (ch. i. 22, ii. 14). This development of the life implanted in the new birth is also a continuous purification of the soul (ch. i. 22), a putting away of all wickedness (ch. ii. 1, cf. iv. 2), in love to the brethren (ch. i. 22), and in obedience to Christian truth,—an obedience which, taken precisely, is nothing but an obedience to Christ Himself (ch. i. 2), the risen Christ, and hence to His word as the word of God (ch. i. 23, 25), which is to be looked upon as the fitting and pure spiritual nourishment for those who are born again (ch. ii. 2). By accepting and obeying this word, Christians prove themselves to be obedient children of God (ch. i. 14), not "fashioning their lives according to their former lusts," but according to the nature

and will of the holy God. Purification is conditional on the continual working power of the atoning death of Christ, with whose blood Christians are sprinkled (ch. i. 2, 18 f., ii. 24, iv. 1), and on the Holy Spirit (ch. i. 2, 22), who rests on Christians as a Spirit of glory and power (ch. iv. 14), as a higher principle, which raises them above the world. In virtue of this life, Christians will abstain from fleshly lusts (ch. ii. 11, iv. 2-4), and be sober and watch unto prayer (ch. iv. 7), keeping themselves ready, both for a vigorous resistance to the temptations caused by the devil, as they then existed in the persecutions of Christians (ch. v. 8), and also for the manifestation of Jesus Christ. Christians, then, will be submissive, patient, and confident under their undeserved sufferings for the sake of the gospel (ch. iv. 12-16, 19, iii. 14-17, ii. 19-21), committing their souls to a faithful Creator (ch. iv. 19). Lastly, they will be full of love to their fellow-men and fellow-Christians (ch. iii. 8-11, i. 22, ii. 17, iv. 8-11). Under these conditions the spiritual growth of Christians goes on (ch. ii. 2); they are perfected, strengthened, and established (ch. v. 10). Peter lays down, in numerous isolated passages, that this new life is to show itself in social relations, in the State (ch. ii. 13 f.), in domestic life (ch. iii. 1 ff.), and in masters and servants (ch. ii. 18). Thus will believers be preserved for a future salvation (ch. i. 5). This hope of completed salvation (ch. i. 3, 13, 21, iii. 15, iv. 13), and this salvation itself, forms the third point in the teaching as to its appropriation. In the beginning of the epistle (ch. i. 5, 9), the new life is essentially and specially placed in relation to the impending completion of salvation, the *σωτηρία ψυχῶν* (ch. i. 4-9, iv. 13, v. 4, 10). This is the "end of faith" (ch. i. 9), the "inheritance preserved in heaven" for Christians (ver. 4), the "exceeding joy" (ch. iv. 13), the unfading crown of glory (ch. v. 4), the eternal divine glory (ch. v. 10). This salvation is imperishable (ch. i. 4, v. 10), full of honour (ch. v. 4, i. 7 f.), a glorious state, prepared by God (ch. v. 10), but also a gift of grace.

Peter also considers this state of salvation in its objective aspect. It is a condition which is continually based on God. Christians are *ἐκλεκτοί* (ch. i. 2, ii. 9). Their salvation, therefore, depends upon a divine election, which does not belong to time, but is according to the *πρόγνωσις Θεοῦ πατρός* (ch. i. 2), which, in reference to the person of the Redeemer, is to be considered as

existing before the foundation of the world. This election is brought to bear by the calling (ver. 15) out of darkness into light (ch. ii. 9). He who is thus called is also "begotten again" (ch. i. 3). Regeneration and continuous purification take place through the Spirit (ver. 2) and the word of truth (ver. 22); and by the power of God Christians are kept unto salvation (ver. 5), and are completely strengthened (ch. v. 10). But Peter also refers all appropriated salvation to Christ,—to the atonement and purification through His blood (ch. i. 2, 18 f., ii. 24, iv. 1); to the word of Christ, to which obedience is rendered (ch. i. 2, 11); to the resurrection of Christ (ch. i. 3, 11, iii. 11), and His exaltation to the right hand of God (ver. 22); to the completed manifestation of Christ (ch. i. 7, 13, v. 4) as the Judge (ch. iv. 5).

This appropriated salvation is not merely individual in its nature, but on it is based *the Christian fellowship* (ch. ii. 4-10, i. 22, ii. 1, iv. 8-11, v. 1-5). It has its *objective cause* in Christ, the founder of a new *life in common*, fore-ordained by God, but rejected by men,—the living corner-stone of a spiritual building (ch. ii. 4, 6). The *subjective condition* is therefore, primarily, the fellowship with Christ as the founder of this community of life (ch. ii. 4), in faith in Him (vers. 6, 7). Out of their former error and wandering, Christians have been led to Christ, the "Shepherd and Bishop of their souls" (ch. ii. 25), being no longer wanderers, but united to Christ's flock. The corner-stone is the foundation of a well-built edifice. Every one who connects himself with it is built into it as a living stone, in brotherly love (ch. i. 22, ii. 1, 17, iii. 8, iv. 8), and also in the conscientious application of all the gifts of grace bestowed upon individuals for mutual salvation and the glorification of God through Christ (ch. iv. 10). Herein is likewise and specially included the unselfish and willing ministry of the chiefs and teachers of the community, as examples to the flock (ch. v. 1-4), and also the ready subordination of the other members to these as elders, to whom honour and obedience are due (ch. v. 5). Any aspiration after "filthy lucre" is especially excluded (ver. 2); also any constrained ministry, as if a man were compelled to it against his inward feelings. The expression *ἐκκλησία* is not to be found in Peter's Epistle.

In taking a retrospective glance at Peter's teaching as to salvation, we find the subjective Christian life represented as a

life of faith, hope, and love. When it is said that Paul is the apostle of *faith*, John of *love*, and Peter of *hope*, nothing really decisive is thus laid down. Peter certainly sets forth *hope* with special emphasis, but he bases it on *faith*, and combines it with *love*.

In comparing Peter's teaching as to salvation with that of James, it is evident that the profound and numerous references of salvation to the Christology, and also the comprehensive relation of the same to God the Father, the Spirit, and Christ, are to be sought for in vain in James. Also Peter's view of salvation as a new moral life, and as a hope of salvation, or as the completed salvation itself, is in part different from the way in which James sets forth the same subject, although neither of these points is altogether wanting. (1.) The future salvation is made by Peter the subject of hope, and the more prominently from his taking the latter as his starting-point in the consideration of salvation (ch. i. 3), and in his exhortations to a Christian life, takes it in part as his basis (ch. i. 13 f.). The hope of salvation is not placed so much in the foreground by James, although he makes salvation the end of the promise and the heirship of the βασιλεία (ch. i. 12, ii. 5), consequently also the subject of hope, in which those that are suffering take comfort (ch. i. 12), and those of low degree attain dignity (ch. ii. 5, i. 10). (2.) Both by James and Peter the new moral life is decidedly set forth; also the new birth is mentioned by both apostles, although James places it in no very close relation to the new moral life, whilst Peter expressly bases the latter on the new birth, and characterizes it as an unfolding of the divine power of life implanted by the new birth, and of the germ then ingrafted. This is a step in advance in the development of doctrine. Peter also goes further, by placing the new moral life in a closer relation to the person of Christ, namely, as love to Him being invisible (ch. i. 8); as obedience to Him (ch. i. 2); as following His example (ch. ii. 21–23, iii. 17, 18); as the result of His atoning death and His resurrection (ch. ii. 24, iv. 1, 2, i. 2, 3, 18–21). James, indeed, derives good works from faith, and impartial brotherly love from faith in the Lord Jesus Christ; but the manifold relations of the new life to Christ which Peter displays are wanting in James' Epistle. (3.) Lastly, James mentions forgiveness of sins and justification,—ideas, the first of which is certainly met with in Peter's discourses recorded in the Acts, but is not explicitly set forth in the epistle (except

so far as ch. iv. 8 may be thought to refer to it); the second, however, is never directly named by Peter. The atonement through the sufferings and death of Christ, that is, through His blood, is so prominently displayed by Peter, that this idea seems to pervade the whole of his epistle; but neither the atonement as Christ's action, nor Christ's sufferings and death, are mentioned by James. Also the fellowship in salvation is briefly, though instructively, set forth by Peter, evidently with a purpose, though he does not name the *ἐκκλησία*. Thus we see that Peter's teaching as to salvation goes further than that of James.

Peter agrees with *Paul* in respect to the doctrine of salvation, —(1) in deriving subjective salvation from the dead and risen Christ, and in a further reference of the same to God; (2) in the distinction between regeneration and sanctification, and in the basing of the latter on the former; (3) in deriving the atonement from the vicarious sufferings and death of Christ; (4) in alluding to the blessedness of heaven, and in setting forth the hope of the same; (5) in making faith the principal condition for all salvation; (6) in the description of Christian fellowship; —but all these doctrines, on account of the greater extent of his writings, are usually more copiously developed by Paul. Paul deals differently with the subject of the forgiveness of sins and justification, by taking man's need of redemption as his base, and enlarging on the inability of the law to free men from sin, and the satisfaction of every need by Christ as the Atoner, under the condition of faith in Him. This mode of treatment involves a much more amplified teaching, both as to salvation and sin, than that of Peter.

§ 68. *Review of the System and Position of the Apostle Peter.*

Peter's system presents essentially all that we have found in James' Epistle; but we also notice an ample Christology, which is based on the historical appearance of Christ, and an internal union of this causality of salvation with salvation itself. But we also notice the point at which Peter stops. We do not find any didactic explanation as to Christ being the *ἀρχηγὸς τῆς ζωῆς* and the *σωτήρ*. Peter gives an impression of the person of Christ, which must be accounted as a characteristic of Christianity generally. Christ is the object of divine worship (ch. iv. 11, cf. v. 11). But Peter, like James, does not enter into the question, "Why

Christ should come?" and "Why He should have *so* come?" Peter, nevertheless, sets forth essentially that Christ's appearance is the fulfilment of prophecy; and that this appearance is not only necessary because it was predicted, but also, and expressly, because it is grounded on the everlasting divine counsel. Both in Peter, and also in James, the appearance of Christ will appear, to an attentive reader, subjectively necessary, in virtue of man's need of redemption, although this idea, the matter not being controversially treated, is not expressly defined. The Petrine teaching, therefore, falls short of the more developed apostolic doctrine. (1.) That, in reference to the causality of salvation, the person of Christ is not developed in detail. (2.) That, in the doctrine of sin as the need for redemption, the principle of sin in man, which is the groundwork of all actual sin, is set forth and developed by Paul *ex professo*, whilst by Peter it is rather presupposed. (3.) That the doctrine of salvation is not, *ex professo*, represented in its full distinction from that which was presented under the Old Testament dispensation. These points are of so weighty a nature, that it is impossible to allow that the first Epistle of Peter is wholly and solely Pauline,—an idea which, in modern times, is rashly asserted. It is not a mere case of some points omitted, but the standpoint is essentially different. In this epistle the apostle does not go so far as, *ex professo*, to set forth and develop the distinction between the Christian and Old Testament religions. Also, the opinion that the first Epistle of Peter contains all of the Pauline system which had passed into the Church, is not tenable. For in this case, as it is still presupposed that an important difference existed between Peter and Paul, it is inexplicable why this epistle should have been from the very first accepted as Petrine.

The teaching of the first Epistle of Peter agrees completely with the historical position of the Apostle Peter. To him the task fell of being the first to bear testimony to Christ's appearance, and of founding the Christian community. For this purpose a teaching like that of James would not have been fitted. The testimony of Christ's personal appearance must first be accepted, and on the standpoint of the old covenant it must be shown that the prophecy of the latter was fulfilled in Jesus Christ; and then only could the peculiar framework of Christianity find a place. The Church at Jerusalem was at first the metropolis of Jewish

Christianity, whilst that of the Gentile converts was formed at Antioch; but if we regard its foundation, we must look upon the former as the mother Church of the whole of Christendom. It was not Peter's desire to establish a national Church among the Jews. It was therefore soon necessary for him to come in contact with the Gentiles (Acts x.); and we find him assuming a position more adapted to the Gentile Christians than that of James. His teaching is of the same character. The person of Christ as the Lord and Prince of life is placed in relation to the whole of mankind in its simultaneous and successive totality; but yet the distinction between Christianity and the old covenant is not expressly set forth, the former being chiefly considered as the fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy.

§ 69. *Comparison of the Petrine System with the Gospels of Matthew and Mark.*

In our comparison of James' system of doctrine with the Gospel of Matthew, we have seen that the purport of the former's epistle is essentially allied to the Sermon on the Mount; but we also recognised that another side of the question is displayed by Matthew, namely, the fulfilment of prophecy in Christ and His work. We are thus led beyond James' sphere of teaching into that of Peter. The appearance of the Messiah, as set forth in the Petrine system, calls to mind Matthew's handling of the subject, and more especially in the mode in which that appearance is referred back to prophecy, without, indeed, entering into any details as to the inner nature of the person of Christ, although a very high idea of the latter may be gathered from certain expressions.

The Gospel of Mark, however, corresponds in some respects still more closely to the Petrine system of teaching. Of the historical appearance and person of Christ Peter says nothing, but that He had been chosen by God from all eternity, and that He was therefore the subject of prophecy. Matthew gives an account of the supernatural birth of Jesus; but Mark commences with the Messianic appearance of the Lord, and the announcement of Him by the Baptist as His prophetic harbinger. The beginning of the Messianic work of salvation is the public appearance of the Lord, and Peter (Acts i. 21 f.) thus describes the extent of the apostolic testimony. Mark, therefore, gives no account of the person of Christ which goes back beyond His baptism by John. On the

other hand, he follows out the Messianic progress up to the exaltation of Christ to heaven (Mark xvi. 19),—a fact which Matthew has not received into his gospel. But Peter also follows out the Messianic course to this point (1 Pet. iii. 22). Also Christ's deep humiliation in His sufferings and death, which are prominently displayed by Peter, is historically set forth by Mark as an atonement for men, the Lord's words corroborating the same. In this, too, Mark's customary brevity assumes a wonderful amplification.

§ 70. *Comparison of Peter's System of Doctrine with the Second Epistle of Peter.*

The standpoint in this epistle is, generally speaking, the same as Peter's generally,—Christianity being looked upon as the fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy (ch. i. 19–21; cf. 1 Pet. i. 10–12). The author of this epistle, who describes himself as having already addressed these readers to whom he again writes, well knowing that the putting off of his earthly tabernacle is at hand, as had been shown him by the Lord Jesus Christ, appeals to his own experience of the power and presence of the Lord, as an eye-witness of His glory and majesty (ch. i. 16), mentioning the fact of the glorification of Christ, and the heavenly voice accompanying it (Matt. xvii. 5). He further says (ver. 19) that, in virtue of this experience, we have in the words of prophecy something even the more sure. Christians, therefore, through the historical life of Christ and the apostolical testimony as to it, have in the words of the Old Testament a *confirmed* prophecy, in taking heed of which they do well, as of a light shining in darkness until the day-star arise in their hearts in Christ's kingdom. Because prophecy is of divine and not of human origin, and has proceeded from the Holy Ghost (ver. 21), its interpretation is not to be the private work of man (ver. 20); but to "the holy men of God, who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," are contrasted false prophets under both the old and new covenants. In this epistle, however, they are spoken of as future, whilst Jude depicts them as already existing, and alludes to the judgment impending on them. Therefore the readers are to take warning, and to be mindful of Old Testament prophecy and the apostolic words (ch. iii. 1 ff.), not desponding if Christ's coming were delayed. Thus the second Epistle of Peter also looks upon Chris-

tianity as the fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy, without any detailed distinction between the old and new covenants being closely entered into.

With regard to the particular doctrines expressed in this epistle, abundant motives are derived from the Christology and the doctrine of salvation, both of which also exercise an influence on the mode in which the idea of God is dealt with.

The epistle makes copious mention of the *person of Christ*. He is everywhere Jesus Christ, through whom all salvation is to fall to the lot of man. He is *σωτήρ* (ch. i. 1), *Κύριος ἡμῶν* (ch. i. 2, 8, 16), *Κύριος καὶ σωτήρ* (ch. ii. 20, iii. 18). His exaltation and His power are spoken of, in reference, indeed, to His earthly life and His *μεγαλειότης* (ch. i. 16 f.). He has an "everlasting kingdom" (ver. 11), and His future appearance and the judgment which He will hold are specially set forth (ch. iii. 4–13). The expressions used are *παρουσία* (ver. 4) and *ἡμέρα Κυρίου* (ver. 10). This appearance is to be distinguished from the *παρουσία* mentioned in ch. i. 16 (His presence during His life on earth); in ch. iii. 12 it is more distinctly defined as the *παρουσία τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμέρας*. This Christ is so exalted, that to Him the divine doxology is ascribed (ch. iii. 18, where there is no possibility of doubt that *αὐτῷ* refers to Christ). Indeed, there is one passage in this epistle (ch. i. 1), where, according to grammar, it must be decided that Christ is called God, if the grammatical position of the article be correct. But we have no right to assume this; for in ver. 2 *Θεός* and *Ἰησοῦς* are again placed in juxtaposition, and in other places the position of the article is not quite exact. Nevertheless, the way in which Christ is spoken of sufficiently shows that He is altogether looked upon as a subject of veneration and worship. But this epistle does not go into the question of the pre-existent Christ and His relation to God. So far the Christology is similar to that in the first epistle, although one difference may be recognised. In the second epistle the glorification on the Mount is mentioned (ch. i. 18) as an anticipation of the heavenly glorification. On the other hand, the second epistle takes no special notice of the sufferings and death of Christ; only in ch. ii. 1 there is an allusion to the atonement (*τὸν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοὺς ἑαυτοῦ*).

The *teaching as to salvation* pervades the whole epistle. Salvation is designated as *τὰ πρὸς ζωὴν καὶ εἰσεβείαν* (ch. i. 3). But

the most pregnant expression among many in the New Testament is, that Christians are *θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως* (ch. i. 4). We are thus led back to Jesus' conversation with Nicodemus recorded by John. We also learn that everything is given to us by His divine power (ver. 3). Salvation also comprises *purification from former sins* (ch. i. 9), which presupposes forgiveness, and includes justification, and is also the perfecting for the entry into Christ's everlasting kingdom (ver. 11), to which an entry shall be "abundantly ministered." This salvation depends on the divine power, and on the *δικαιοσύνη* of God and our Saviour Jesus Christ (ch. i. 1). *Δικαιοσύνη* is the righteous conduct of God in His covenant-relation, presupposing the atonement and the new covenant. This salvation has an *objective and a subjective condition*. The former is the *κλήσις καὶ ἐκλογή ἡμῶν* (ch. i. 10, 3). It is God who, after He has chosen men, calls them to this salvation; but this calling and election must be made sure by man (ver. 10) by certain subjective conditions. Among these *faith* is named (ch. i. 1), where the faith is probably primarily objective, although a subjective faith is also presupposed. In ver. 5 faith appears as the root of all Christian life; and in this faith man is to show forth virtue and the whole system of spontaneous morality, which cannot exist except it is rooted in faith. From this proceeds knowledge, out of which grow the further branches of the Christian *ἀρετή*, both negative and positive, first in reference to the subject's relation to God, and then to his relation to the brethren. *Faith*, therefore, is made the *root of the appropriation of salvation*. But in this epistle *ἐπίγνωσις* (also *γνώσις*) is specially named, and faith falls somewhat into the background. The knowledge of God is mentioned (ch. i. 3), and of Jesus the Lord (ver. 2); also the knowledge of Jesus Christ our Lord (ver. 8, ii. 20, cf. i. 5, 6, iii. 18). In this connection *γνώσις* is not merely a partial theoretical knowledge. But in the first epistle we do not find this prominence given to *γνώσις* and *ἐπίγνωσις*. A twofold point, also, which was set forth in the first epistle, holds in the second a subordinate position, the *atonement* (doubtless hinted at in ch. i. 8, ii. 1, but only presupposed) and *regeneration*. On the other hand (because the *παρουσία* and future judgment are so fully entered into), the idea of the renewal of the world is included in that of salvation (ch. iii. 10–13), in which the world will become one "in which dwelleth righteousness" (ver. 13).

The teaching as to the person of Christ and as to salvation reverts back to the teaching as to God, because God is considered as the origin of all salvation. God is *our God* (ch. i. 1), and God the Father in reference to Jesus Christ (ver. 17), who has so called us that in His calling His glory and virtue chiefly appear. In connection with Christ's second appearance, God's judgment is brought forward (ch. iii. 12), and the renewal as well as the creation and destruction of the world "by the word of God" (vers. 5-7). The mention of the Holy Spirit in this epistle is confined to the Spirit which moved in the holy men of God, the prophets, without naming the intervention of Christ. The Holy Spirit is not spoken of in His relation to faithful believers,—a subject copiously dwelt upon in the first epistle. Salvation is, however, described as a participation in the divine nature.

Generally speaking, therefore, the didactic purport of this epistle assumes the same standpoint as that of the first epistle, and of Peter's discourses in the Acts. In points of detail a difference is perceptible; and to some extent an Alexandrine colouring is evident, owing to which it may be said to occupy a middle position between the Petrine and Johannean systems. Criticism, therefore, must direct its investigation to the point whether and how far these differences may be explained by the diversity of the date, the circumstances, the position of the readers, the inducement for writing, and the aim, or if another author must necessarily be assumed. It is, however, beyond doubt that the didactic purport of the epistle is excellent to a high degree,—a fact which must render any prudent criticism all the more circumspect.

§ 71. *Conclusion to be drawn from this Section.*

The result of our previous considerations must be that the doctrinal ideas which form the first fundamental shape of the apostolic teaching are an actual organic doctrinal system, and that, within their prescribed limits, nothing is omitted in setting forth the characteristic nature of Christianity. But, in speaking of an "organic doctrinal system," we do not intend that the schemes of teaching so far developed form a complete system of Christian doctrine, only that every scheme of teaching is an organic whole, with an internal unity and arrangement, in opposition to the view that there is nothing in each but a mere aggregate of doctrinal opinions and assertions. However much the systems of

James and Peter may be looked upon as incomplete representations of Christian doctrine, each nevertheless constitutes a whole, in which a fundamental view of Christianity is set forth to which every separate element of doctrine is suitable. Taking this as the indisputable result of our previous considerations, a very favourable light is thus thrown on the personality of the authors, who had appropriated Christianity simply as a living organic whole.

II. THE SECOND FORM OF APOSTOLIC TEACHING ;

OR, CHRISTIANITY IN ITS DISTINCTION FROM THE OLD TESTAMENT.

I. APOSTOLIC TEACHING ACCORDING TO PAUL.

§ 72. *Our Sources of Information as to Paul's Teaching.*

From these sources we must exclude the Epistle to the Hebrews, which does not bear the apostle's name at the commencement, and, generally, is deficient in the style peculiar to the apostle. Its author, also, nowhere gives any intimation of being the Apostle Paul, but, on the contrary, appears to describe himself in ch. ii. 3 as a disciple of the apostles. The opinion as to its Pauline origin met, therefore, with much opposition even in ancient times. Whether its antiquity goes back to a date before the destruction of Jerusalem is doubtful ; but, at all events, it is made use of by Clement of Rome in his first Epistle to the Corinthians. The Western Church, however, did not recognise it as Paul's. The Alexandrian recognised the purport, but not the language, as Paul's ; whilst the Syrian Church received it into their canon ; and in the Greek Church, after the middle of the third century, its Pauline origin was generally acknowledged. Eusebius is aware of the previous doubts, and pronounces it to be Paul's, having been translated from the Hebrew by one of the apostle's disciples ; but he cannot appeal to any historical testimony in favour of the latter fact. Looking at this uncertainty in ecclesiastical tradition, criticism must base its decision on internal grounds. But the internal grounds are not favourable to a direct Pauline authorship, notwithstanding the peculiar force, depth, and excellence of the whole contents.

In excluding this epistle, we must, on the other hand, deny that there is any sufficient reason for banishing from the number of the genuine Pauline epistles any one of the thirteen which bear the apostle's name. In the ancient Church all were recognised as Pauline without contradiction, although apostolical authority has been denied them by opponents of the Apostle Paul. Modern criticism holds as undeniably genuine the Epistle to the Galatians, the two Epistles to the Corinthians, and that to the Romans; and happily these are the very epistles which are of the highest importance as regards their doctrinal matter. The two last chapters of the Epistle to the Romans have, however, been questioned. The substance of the epistle remains unaffected by this, but the doubts themselves have met with the most decided opposition. The nine other epistles have all been attacked by modern criticism.

The Pastoral Epistles have been the most assailed, especially the first Epistle to Timothy by Schleiermacher, who pronounces it to be a compilation from the second Epistle to Timothy and that to Titus. Eichhorn has sought to impugn the genuineness of all three epistles; and De Wette shared his doubts, looking upon the first epistle as most decidedly a compilation. Schott holds Luke to be their author. Credner looks upon the Epistle to Titus as genuine, and believes that the second Epistle to Timothy is based upon two genuine epistles of Paul, which had been altered by an author who also composed the first Epistle to Timothy. The arguments against the genuineness are mostly concerned with the language and style, and the materials are merely of a negative kind; and an endeavour has been made to show that certain circumstances do not harmonize with the time of Paul.

Three only of the rest of the epistles—the second to the Thessalonians, and those to the Ephesians and Colossians—were attacked in early times. The genuineness of the second Epistle to the Thessalonians has been assailed, partly on account of its relation to the first epistle, and partly on account of its teaching as to Antichrist, by E. Chr. Schmidt and by De Wette (with the concession that there were no really adequate grounds, and that the contents of the epistle were excellent); also by Kern (*Tubing. Zeitschr.* 1839, ii.), in opposition to whom Pelt and De Wette subsequently maintained its genuineness. The Epistle to the Ephesians has also been impugned, on account of certain features

which cause surprise both in their own nature and their relation to the Epistle to the Colossians. Thereon De Wette has based his doubts as to its genuineness, in which doubts Usteri agrees, in his development of the Pauline system. De Wette is, however, bound to confess that there are no adequate grounds for rejecting this epistle, which has been acknowledged as genuine by the unanimous voice of antiquity, and contains so much that is fully worthy of the apostle, and could hardly have been expected from any imitators. All the commentaries of modern times have maintained the genuineness of this epistle, in opposition to De Wette, who, however, in his commentary, has held fast to his opinion. The Epistle to the Colossians has been attacked by Meyerhoff, and has found defenders in Huther and De Wette. These three epistles, and, in addition, the three others, have been called in question by criticism in Baur's *Paulus* and Schwegler's *Nachapostolischen Zeitalter*. The question depends on internal grounds, and, on the whole, has met with but little support; so that we are not justified in excluding these epistles from our sources of information as to Paul's doctrinal system.

As regards *the relation which these epistles bear to the Pauline teaching*, their importance depends on their *authenticity* and their *richness in doctrinal matter*. Happily, as before remarked, the most important in the one point are also the most important in the other. These four must, therefore, form the groundwork of our consideration; but each of the others which follow them are also well fitted to add their contribution to the sum of Pauline teaching. Looking at the rapid development of the Christian Church in the earliest ages, as well as the variability of the apostle's mind, and the energy with which he withstood any unchristian modification of Christian doctrine, it is but natural that into the later epistles certain doctrinal statements have found their way which do not exist in the earlier writings. We shall, however, have to call attention to the point that these later definitions of doctrine result almost necessarily from the earlier ones, so soon as there was any occasion to throw a light upon the latter from a fresh point of view. But in all this the apostle has not altered his dogmatical views. Less in him than in any one are the doctrines of Christianity an aggregate of formulæ: they are, on the contrary, an organic whole, which, in the course of time, and according to circumstances, becomes more and more developed. We shall

therefore be compelled to keep apart the earlier and later epistles, calling attention to the points where any important difference exists between them.

This division of the epistles, according to their date, has a special interest as far as biblical theology is concerned, on account of the course of development to be observed in the teaching contained in them.

In the first place, we have those written before the long-protracted imprisonment of the apostle. The earliest are the two Epistles to the Thessalonians written from Corinth (cf. Acts xviii. 1-18); next, the Epistle to the Galatians, written most probably from Ephesus after the apostle had visited the earlier-founded churches (Acts xviii. 23), and had sojourned two years in Ephesus (Acts xix. 1). The first Epistle to the Corinthians was likewise written from Ephesus towards the end of his stay there (1 Cor. xvi. 8-10; Acts xix. 21 f.). The second Epistle to the Corinthians was written about half a year later from Macedonia, before his three months' sojourn in Achaia (Acts xx. 3). At this time also must be placed the Epistle to the Romans, written in Corinth during the apostle's second visit to this city (Acts xx. 2 f.; Rom. xvi. 1, 23), shortly before his last journey to Syria and Jerusalem (Rom. xv. 25 ff.; Acts xx. 3).

Next, we have the epistles written during the apostle's imprisonment. Paul was two years a captive in Caesarea, and spent half a year in his journey to Rome, and at least two years in captivity there. This imprisonment naturally forms an epoch in Paul's apostolic ministry. Even in Caesarea his friends and disciples had access to the imprisoned apostle; and in Rome he was permitted to dwell in his own hired house (although fettered and kept by a soldier), and to receive a large number of visitors (Acts xxviii. 30 f.). We have a number of epistles which must be dated during this time; viz. the Epistle to the Ephesians, the Colossians, and to Philemon, and, somewhat later, the Epistle to the Philippians. These four were most probably written at Rome.

The dates of the three Pastoral Epistles cannot be fixed with the same degree of certainty. Many place them after the apostle's imprisonment, as the epistles assume a liberation, and then an interval of time, and, finally, a second captivity, ending with martyrdom. Others look for the date of all three epistles, or, at least, of the first to Timothy and that to Titus, in that period of the apostle's

life which is related in the Acts. At all events, the second Epistle to Timothy expressly claims to have been written during a captivity in Rome, in a position which the apostle considers perilous.

In figuring to ourselves the motive which induced the writing of these epistles, we find in most of them indications of the existence of certain antagonistic views, in opposing which the apostle is led to consider various topics.

There were certain errors *as to Christ's second appearance* (namely, that it was immediately impending) against which the apostle contended in the Church of Thessalonica. This idea was at first to some extent local; but another line of error was more deeply grounded, and therefore more widely spread.

This consisted of Judaizing opinions of a Pharisaical tendency. Against this legal bent Paul had to contend all his life long, not only against the zealots who operated against his teaching within the Church itself, but also against the unbelieving Jews who were stirred up against Paul, because in his treatment of the gospel they found the harshest opposition to their own nationality. These feelings, indeed, led to his captivity. Most of the apostle's principal epistles touch upon this line of error. They vindicate both the teaching of the apostle and also Paul's apostolic authority (the Epistle to the Galatians; cf. also Phil. iii. 4-6); or the Pauline doctrine of salvation, as independent of the Mosaic law, is laid down and developed in opposition to a legal standpoint within Christianity itself (the Epistle to the Romans); or the apostolic authority of Paul is vindicated against more or less hostile opponents (the two Epistles to the Corinthians, which, however, are rich in other doctrinal matter). Among the epistles written to oppose the Pharisaical legal tendency, the chief is the Epistle to the Romans, which almost exclusively deals with the opposition to the Pauline doctrine that salvation is independent of the law of Moses. The rest of the epistles bring forward other points which are subjected to controversy and discussion.

There is another standpoint which is combated in some of the later epistles,—a theosophical or gnostic tendency manifested in the gradual development of the churches, which tendency asserted itself in Asia Minor towards the latter end of Paul's career. We find this opposition in the Epistles to the Colossians and Ephesians, which take a prevailing Christological standpoint, and also in the three Pastoral Epistles, which, however, take special

notice of the then existing circumstances of the churches to which they are addressed.

As regards Paul's discourses in the Acts of the Apostles, from ch. xiii. onwards there are many noteworthy utterances recorded, addressed to Jews, Gentiles, and Christians. We may notice that the contents of these discourses dovetail exactly into the Pauline system as known from the epistles, and that especially the address to the Jews, in Acts xiii. 16-41, contains characteristic Pauline features. Therefore there is no foundation for the assertion, that in the Acts of the Apostles Paul speaks in the same way as Peter, and Peter as Paul. These discourses afford no ground for doubting their historical authenticity, for the author evidently had full acquaintance with the apostle and his ministry. In comparison with the opulence of direct testimony which we possess in the epistles, these discourses, which come to us, so to speak, at second hand, are of subordinate value. They are not, however, without special interest, because, unlike the epistles, they are mostly addressed to non-Christians. Although in them the apostle expresses his opinions with great moderation, his fundamental views are nevertheless made evident, not only in reference to universality, but also as regards salvation being independent of the law (Acts xiii. 16-47). Also, the mode is noteworthy in which Paul sets forth Christianity in the presence of idolaters (Acts xiv., xvii.), where the pregnant germ is contained of that which he so beautifully expresses in Rom. i., ii., which, too, has been called his natural theology.

§ 73. *Paul's Conception of Christianity generally.*

Paul recognises it as his apostolical task to set forth *salvation in Christ in its independence of the law*. In 1 Cor. i. 24 (cf. ch. ii.) he characterizes Christianity as *the power and wisdom of God*, in contrast to that which is sought after by the Jews and Greeks, and is not found in Christianity. In this passage it is only contrasted with that which the Jews seek, and not with the old covenant *per se*. But still the meaning of the apostle is plain, and is more precisely defined by other matter.

The apostle does not confine himself to the abstract idea (1 Cor. i. 18, 24, 25) of Christianity as the *power of God*, but more closely defines it as the manifestation of the *δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ*, independent of the law, and resting on faith on Jesus Christ in

the case of all, without distinction. This is the case in the Epistle to the Romans, of which this subject is the theme. The apostle also looks upon Christianity as the *δύναμις Θεοῦ* unto salvation to every one that believeth (Rom. i. 16); and this preliminary corresponds with the *λόγος δυνάμενος σῶσαι τὰς ψυχὰς* of James (Jas. i. 21; cf. 1 Pet. i. 23–25); but in this passage universality is stated to be the characteristic of Christianity (cf. Rom. i. 16 f., iii. 21 f.; 2 Cor. iii. 9, v. 17–21; Gal. ii. 21). The *δικαιοσύνη* before God, and of God, is actually revealed in the gospel, which not only teaches it, but realizes it. By its realization men are made conscious of it; so that faith is not only the condition requisite for the realization and bringing to man's consciousness of the *δικαιοσύνη*, but is always the condition under which the *δικαιοσύνη* is present. In Rom. iii. 21 f. that which was the theme in ch. i. 17 is manifested *χωρὶς νόμου*. Also, in 1 Cor. i. 30 it is said that Christ is made our *δικαιοσύνη*. In 2 Cor. iii. 9, v. 21, *δικαιοσύνη* is mentioned chiefly as the essential matter in salvation. Also, in the Epistle to the Galatians this fundamental idea of *δικαιοσύνη* and *δικαιωθῆναι* is displayed (Gal. ii. 16, 17, 21), and they are represented as a peculiar effect of the death of Christ.

Christianity is also the *Spirit which gives life*, in contrast to the *letter which killeth* (2 Cor. iii. 6–9). The apostle characterizes the old covenant as a dead letter (ver. 6),—that is, a law external to man, which accuses man by means of his conscience, without urging, quickening, or ruling him, and can therefore condemn man as opposing its rule, although unable to render him conformable to this rule. The law is described as condemnatory, and but temporary in its endurance. On the contrary, Paul describes the new covenant (1) as *giving life* (ver. 6),—that is, as a power which is not only living but quickening, and communicates to man a new life; (2) as *justifying* and realizing the *δικαιοσύνη* (ver. 9); and (3) as *abiding* (ver. 11; cf. Rom. vii. 6). In Rom. viii. 2 we find a briefly expressed antithesis: Christianity is *ὁ νόμος τοῦ πνεύματος τῆς ζωῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*. This *νόμος* frees from the law of sin and death. Two *νόμοι* are placed in juxtaposition, under one of which sin and death had been the ruling power; but in the fellowship with Christ Jesus the Spirit which gives life from and in God has become the ruling power. The law of sin and death is not directly the law of the Old

Testament, for the law is in itself holy and good (ch. vii. 12). The law of sin and death is rather to be taken *subjectively* as something inherent in man (ch. vii. 23, 25). The life-giving Spirit is the Spirit of God, the objective divine Spirit, so far as He abides in believers (ch. viii. 9-11), quickening them (ver. 10) and guiding them (ver. 14). This Spirit of God is represented by Paul as a νόμος, for the sake of the contrast with, in the first place, the νόμος ἁμαρτίας in man, and next, with the Old Testament law, which was in no way able to remove the power of ἁμαρτία and θάνατος, to which man was subject so long as he was under the law. That which was impossible for the law has been effected by the redemption of Christ (ver. 3). Christianity brings with it the life-giving Spirit, which is possessed by every one believing in the gospel (Rom. vii. 6; Gal. iii. 2-5, iv. 6). Christians are sealed in Christ with the Holy Spirit of promise, as the earnest of the everlasting inheritance, which includes the complete redemption (Eph. i. 13 f.). And it is also peculiar to Christianity that, by the death of Christ, Jews and Gentiles, united in one Spirit, have access to the Father (Eph. ii. 18). Christianity gives this quickening Spirit, inasmuch as it is an actual manifestation of the δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ (2 Cor. iii. 9; Gal. iii. 21 f.); it frees from the curse and yoke of sin (Gal. iii. 13). The two ideas—the δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ and the quickening by the Spirit—are of necessity inwardly connected. In stating that Christianity is the power of God, Paul understands by this, that man, through Christianity, is made a partaker of salvation by receiving the δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ and true life.

The Apostle Paul also looks upon Christianity as the *wisdom of God* (in the first Epistle to the Corinthians); it is the manifestation of the all-wise divine counsel for the salvation of men (1 Cor. ii. 7-12). For this very reason it is wise in its substance, in which absolute and divine wisdom are revealed, and makes wise him who believes therein, teaching him to view in the right and divine light the relation of man to God,—indeed, the relation of the entire world to God, and of God to the world,—and showing the true way of salvation both to individuals and all mankind. Paul looks upon Christianity as the wisdom of God, because it is wisdom which is sought after by the Corinthians as Greeks (1 Cor. i. 22), who could not regard Christianity as wisdom, although, when they had actually attained faith in the same, they

would in truth recognise it as the genuine wisdom of God. This wisdom is contrasted with mere human wisdom, and is involved, *ἐν μυστηρίῳ*, in the divine counsel of grace, which was before unknown, but revealed through Christ, and is hidden from the *ἄρχοντες τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου* (ch. ii. 8, 9), but is revealed to Christians by the Spirit of God (ver. 12). Paul, however, takes this point of view not only in the first Epistle to the Corinthians, but also in those to the Ephesians and Colossians, in which the apostle had to do with people who opposed him with the assumption of some higher wisdom, connected, indeed, with the gnostic tendency of thought, which, towards the end of Paul's career, was prevalent in Asia Minor. This is why Paul so prominently and expressly sets forth the *wisdom in Christ*. In Christianity are all the hidden things of wisdom and knowledge which were at first concealed, but so concealed that they are revealed to believers (Col. ii. 3, cf. ver. 8). Eph. iii. 8-11 leads to the same idea; and in the same way 1 Cor. ii. 7-12, with special regard to God's counsel of redemption embracing all men, even the Gentiles; likewise Rom. xi. 33-36. Christianity is the wisdom of God because it is the power of God, because it possesses quickening and justifying power for sinners, and because it leads men to salvation in a way which could be devised by no man,—depending solely on the wisdom of the eternal counsel of God.

All that we have hitherto seen of Paul's assertions as to Christianity, that it was the wisdom and power of God, is so, inasmuch as Christ Himself is *Θεοῦ δύναμις καὶ Θεοῦ σοφία* (1 Cor. i. 24). Christ is the living principle of Christianity, to whom these predicates belong (2 Cor. iii. 17 f.; 1 Cor. xv. 45). Paul, therefore, in describing his own conversion and enlightenment, states that God had revealed His Son in him (Gal. i. 16). Believers have not merely to do with an external word, although faith is, of course, brought about by the *ἀκοή πίστεως* (Gal. iii. 2); man becomes a partaker in faith through the living Christ (Gal. ii. 20), in whom the believer has righteousness (ver. 21). If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His (Rom. viii. 9). By the atonement of Christ all things have become new, so that whosoever is in Him is a new creature (2 Cor. v. 17). The participation in Christianity includes the being conformed to the image of Jesus Christ, so that the Christian becomes the first-born among many brethren (Rom. viii. 29). In dwelling upon the

person of Christ, there are two points which Paul chiefly sets forth, by which we are led back to the mode of his calling: (1) The idea of Christ as the Son of God, by whom men are made the children of God, doing away with the letter of the law; and (2) the idea of Christ as the divine principle of life by whom men are quickened anew.

Thus, in Christianity, something new is presented which was not contained in the law (Rom. viii. 3), and was not, indeed, comprised in the common life which sprung from the first man (Rom. v. 12 ff.; 1 Cor. xv. 45). There exists, therefore, *a contrast between Christianity and the pre-Christian state of man, both in and outside the law*. Everything that was contained in the Old Testament dispensation belongs to the *στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου* (Gal. iv. 1-5; Col. ii. 20): the Jews, just as the Gentiles, were children of wrath (Eph. ii. 3).

The further Paul enters into the distinction between Christianity and the old covenant, the more clearly is represented the connection between the two.

This positive relation is generally expressed by the statement that the promises of the old covenant are fulfilled in Christ. They are in Him *yea and amen*, *i.e.* affirmed and represented in their truth (2 Cor. i. 20). The gospel of God is promised in the old covenant (Rom. i. 2). When, therefore, in contrasting Christianity with the old covenant, Paul says that man is justified by the gospel, *χωρὶς νόμου* (Rom. iii. 21), it is not to be understood that the law had had no reference to the gospel and to that which it gives, but that the latter can be received by the individual independently of the law. But the apostle also gives more special statements as to this positive relation existing between the gospel and the old covenant. That which in the gospel is presented as the main point, was in part intimated or announced in the Old Testament, and in part prepared for.

This main point is in Paul the *δικαιοσύνη ἐκ πίστεως*, which is manifested through the gospel, and is witnessed by the law and the prophets (Rom. iii. 21), consequently by the old covenant in both its sides. A righteousness of faith is both generally acknowledged in it (Rom. i. 17; Gal. iii. 11), and also pre-eminently ascribed to Abraham as the first, and therefore most distinguished, partaker in the covenant (Rom. iv. 3; Gal. iii. 6). The promise was given to Abraham, with a glance at the future justification

of the Gentiles by faith (Gal. iii. 7-9, 14-18, 29; Rom. iv. 23 f.).

Also, the law had an educational aim to prepare for Christ as the author of righteousness of faith (Gal. iii. 19-25, iv. 1-6); for the law was intended to develop in man both a consciousness of sin and also the need of redemption (Gal. iii. 19, 22; Rom. iii. 20, v. 20),—the law being a *παιδαγωγὸς εἰς Χριστόν* (Gal. iii. 24) for the world, which is still in its nonage, and under tutors and governors (Gal. iv. 1 f.). Thus the law, because it develops in man the consciousness of sin, is the divine ordinance of preparation for Christ. Also, on the other hand, prophecy and the typical prophetic history of the old covenant contained a pre-signification of the way of salvation which would be opened through Christ (Gal. iv. 22 ff.; 1 Cor. x. 1 ff.).

Again, Christ, and the relation of God to man which was founded by Him, is prefigured by the statutory law as by a shadow, *i.e.* the incomplete unsubstantial image of the future (Col. ii. 17; cf. Heb. x. 1); and that which is prefigured is realized by the appearance of Christ, and by His work.

Also, eternal life is promised in the old covenant (Tit. i. 2). Men will receive it through the truth in Christ; and it is in this passage the subject of hope.

Thus, that which is the main point in the new covenant is in the old covenant partly intimated and partly prepared for; and Paul may be fully assumed to teach the existence of a connection between the old covenant and the new, but by no means that any one desiring to receive the gospel must first partake in the old covenant.

Even in the passages we have hitherto considered, the characteristics of the Pauline teaching may be discerned. Paul goes back to the principle more than either Peter or James. He cannot, with James, limit himself to the acknowledgment that Christianity is the perfect law of liberty, but is compelled to show how Christianity produces something different from the effects of the old law. He shows that the Old Testament law has failed to produce *δικαιοσύνη*, and why this is the case; also, that that which was impossible for the law has been brought about through Christ. He is therefore obliged to enlarge upon, not only the actual sin of the Jews, but also upon the root of actual sin and the general sinfulness of man. Thus, from Paul's standpoint, we

are led to expect from him a system of teaching as to sin much more developed in its character than that of James and Peter. He was also compelled to dwell upon the positive effects of Christianity in all their peculiarity, and therefore on the peculiar nature of Christ. Not only must he set forth the whole work of Christ, and the various phases of His historical appearance, he must also revert to the nature of Christ's person, and show that in Him abode that very life-giving power which was wanting in the law, and that this power of giving new life resided only in Christ.

It must be evident that these opinions of Paul had an *historical foundation* (cf. § 49). Both before and after his conversion Paul sought for *δικαιοσύνη* before God. But the difference was, that at first he sought it fruitlessly, but had now found it; that he had before sought it in the law, but had now found it in faith in Jesus Christ. Paul therefore comprehended the full distinction between the law and the gospel, which was to him nothing but the practical realization of righteousness before God, independently of the law. The doctrine as to *δικαιοσύνη*, and that as to the person and work of Christ, are closely united in his mind,—the true *δικαιοσύνη* being in his view the work of Christ, achieved through the atonement and communication of the Spirit, and founding a new epoch among mankind. This Christ was Jesus of Nazareth,—no longer the crucified One merely, but living and glorified as He had appeared to the apostle; Christ risen and exalted to heaven, who had died as an atonement for man,—Jesus Christ the Lord.

How he attained this standpoint we have already seen in § 49. The independence which he thus had is evident from the purport of his epistles, in which he himself expressly asserts it. He knows not only that the purport of his teaching is divine wisdom revealed by the Spirit (1 Cor. ii. 6–12), but also that it is stated, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but in those which the Holy Ghost teacheth, claiming that he is *πνευματικός*, and that he therefore has inwardly the *νοῦς* of Christ (ver. 16). He therefore summons to a right understanding of his teaching those persons that have the Spirit (ver. 14 f.). The argumentative and didactic development of his precepts, which is so peculiar to Paul, does not exclude the direct glance of the Spirit, which embraces the whole of Christianity in one. Neither does his con-

sciousness, inspired and enlightened by the divine Spirit, shut out a certain actual acquaintance with the historical appearance of Christ and the word which He delivered, and also various revelations which, in the course of time, had been made to the apostle. As regards the former, Paul was not excluded from the sphere of the historical communications which were current among well-instructed Christians, both as to Christ's person and life, and also as to His words and teaching. Paul, therefore, was conscious that the message of salvation which he preached was entirely in harmony with that of the other apostles (1 Cor. xv. 1 ff.), especially in reference to the resurrection of Christ and the events preceding it. On this point he appeals to the several appearances of the Risen One, to which he adds the manifestation which had been vouchsafed to himself (ver. 8). Thus we find Paul adopting the words of the Lord Himself, both with (1 Cor. vii. 10 ; 1 Thess. v. 2 ; Acts xx. 35¹), and also without (Rom. xii. 14) a direct reference to the Lord. Added to this, Paul makes certain communications in his epistles, appealing to words of the Lord, and stating that the matter therein communicated had been previously hidden, but had been made manifest to him, and was by him revealed (1 Thess. iv. 15 ; 1 Cor. xiv. 37 ; Rom. xi. 25 ; 1 Cor. xv. 51 ; Gal. ii. 2). In this way the passage 1 Cor. xi. 23 may be best interpreted, even if we refer ch. xv. 3 to an historical communication. From 2 Cor. xii. 1 ff. we see that Paul was also the subject of extraordinary divine revelations (cf. Acts xxii. 17).

All this proves that Paul is the independent, original teacher, in whom the peculiar representations of Christian doctrines which are found in his epistles had their first origin. There was, however, a deep need existing in the early Church, which was satisfied in the person of Paul. He therefore found, far and near, a circle both of individual disciples and helpers, and also of churches, who adhered to him as the originator of their special view of Christianity. In consequence of this, Paul emphatically says, *κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου* (Rom. ii. 16, xvi. 25 ; 2 Tim. ii. 8) ; and that this gospel had been communicated to him by the revelation of Jesus Christ (Gal. i. 6 f., 12).

¹ The words of the Lord quoted in the passage, Acts xx. 35, are not recorded by any of the evangelists.—Tr.

§ 74. *The Fundamental Principle and the Arrangement of the Pauline System of Teaching.*

The idea of *δικαιοσύνη* is found throughout Paul's writings, although it is more prominently brought forward in some epistles than in others, according to their aim and the motive which prompted them. *Δικαιοσύνη* is mostly the ruling and fundamental idea in those epistles which contend against the Pharisaical, Judaizing tendency. This idea is eminently the theme in the dogmatical portion of the Epistle to the Romans (ch. i. 17, iii. 22, 25, cf. v. 17, 21, vi. 16, 20, viii. 10, ix. 30 f., x. 3-6, 10, iv. 3, 5, 9, 11, 22). Next comes the Epistle to the Galatians (ch. ii. 21, [16], iii. 21, 6), in which *δικαιοσύνη* is the fundamental idea. In the Epistles to the Corinthians, the passages touching on this subject are—1 Cor. i. 30; 2 Cor. iii. 9, v. 21. In the later epistles it is brought forward in the Epistle to the Philippians (ch. iii. 6, 9, cf. i. 11), and again as the prominent idea in the argument against Judaizing false teachers; also in the Pastoral Epistles, especially in that to Titus (ch. iii. 5, [7]), in exactly the same way as in the earlier epistles. The Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians deal with another opposing element in the Church, and therefore the idea of *δικαιοσύνη* occurs but seldom, and then in an ethical signification (Eph. iv. 24, v. 9); likewise in the Epistles to Timothy (1 Tim. vi. 11, [i. 9]). We are nevertheless justified in representing this idea as being the fundamental one, as this has been done by the apostle himself in passages where the teaching most peculiar to him is most copiously set forth.

Δικαιοσύνη refers to the *moral relation of man to God*. According to Aristotle's etymology, the word *δίκαιος* has a reference to a relation subsisting between several persons, and denotes that in this relation one subject is just in his relation to the other subject. Looking to its meaning in the Bible, *דָּקָא* points in the root to the signification, *to be straight, plain*, then *moral truth and goodness*, but chiefly *righteousness*. The one great relation of man is, in the Old Testament, his relation to God; and from this every other is derived. In this relation God's will is the rule by which it is to be framed, and it depends on God's sure and infallible judgment, and not on our own opinion as to our conformity to the divine will. So far, the religious relation is an essentially moral relation of dependence and fellowship, which, if it is adequately

realized, is described by *δικαιοσύνη*, and with which the theocratical citizenship with all its blessings corresponds. The fundamental idea of *δικαιοσύνη* has this peculiarity, that it is rooted both in Old Testament and New Testament ground. It is the connecting link which joins Saul, the man of the law, and Paul, the man of faith. In the Old Testament, the religious relation is specially defined as one of a theocratical character, the relation of a covenant between God and the Israelites. The conformity of the subject to this covenant is *δικαιοσύνη* on the part both of God and man. We find this idea transferred to Paul's system: whosoever is truly *δίκαιος* is *δίκαιος παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ* (Rom. ii. 13). The acknowledgment of this is called *δικαιοῦν* (Rom. ii. 13, iii. 26, 28, 30). And as, in Paul's view, the idea of *δικαιοσύνη* is rooted in Old Testament ground, the *νόμος Θεοῦ*, and indeed the Old Testament *νόμος*, is the rule of *δικαιοσύνη*, so that in *δικαιοσύνη* is included both a complete fulfilment of the law—*δικ. ἐκ νόμου* (Gal. iii. 21), *ἐξ ἔργων νόμου* (Rom. ix. 32)—and also the efficacious acknowledgment on God's part of this fulfilment of the law, and indeed as of desert or debt (Rom. iv. 4). In this case the subject fulfils the *νόμος Θεοῦ*, as it is required as an *ἐμμένειν ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς γεγραμμένοις* (Gal. iii. 10),—a fulfilment by *ἔργα τὰ ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ* (Tit. iii. 5; cf. Rom. iii. 20, 28). On the contrary, whosoever does not fulfil the law, and is not a *ποιητὴς τοῦ νομοῦ* (Rom. ii. 13), but is *παραβάτης* (ver. 25),—whosoever “continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them” (Gal. iii. 10), he is wanting in this righteousness (Rom. ii. 13, 25, 27); whosoever belongs to those who have sinned, *ὅσοι ἥμαρτον* (Rom. ii. 12, iii. 23), is not *δίκαιος παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ* (Rom. ii. 13), but is involved in *ἀδικία* (ch. i. 18, vi. 13), in *ἀνομία* (2 Cor. vi. 14), and is subject to the just punishment of God, or *ὑπόδικος τῷ Θεῷ* (Rom. iii. 19), or *ὑφ' ἁμαρτίαν*, i.e. under the power of sin (Rom. iii. 9); he is burdened with the guilt of sin, and is liable to give satisfaction by punishment, being therefore *ὑπὸ κατάραν* (Gal. iii. 10); he is also the subject of *κατάκρισις* (2 Cor. iii. 9), and has on him the *κατάκριμα* (Rom. viii. 1), and, being condemned, will perish (Rom. ii. 12). All this expresses the punishment which is bound up with guilt, in contrast to the *δικαιοσύνη* as the attribute of him who is acknowledged by God as righteous in relation to Him.

Man is deficient in this *δικαιοσύνη*; and it is not possible for

him to be a partaker of it except by God imputing it to the sinner, not by way of desert and merit (Rom. iv. 4), but according to the rule of free grace, and the love which takes an interest in the miserable sinner (Rom. iv. 3, 5, 9, 11, 22; Gal. iii. 6), conferring it upon him as an unmerited gift (Rom. v. 17), and thus justifying him freely (Rom. iii. 24). This takes place by virtue of the gospel, through faith in Jesus Christ (Rom. iii. 22-31, ix. 30-32, x. 6; Phil. iii. 9).

Hence the idea of *δικαιοσύνη* is of a twofold nature: (1) A man's own righteousness, depending on his own fulfilment of the law, is *δικαιοσύνη ἐμῇ, ἢ ἐκ νόμου* (Phil. iii. 9), *ιδία δικαιοσύνη* (Rom. x. 3), the righteousness which is by the law (Rom. x. 5). The passage (Gal. ii. 21), *ἄρα Χριστὸς δωρεὰν ἀπέθανεν*, applies to this righteousness. It proceeds *ἐξ ἔργων νόμου* (Rom. iii. 20, ix. 32; Tit. iii. 5). On the other hand, it is, (2) The righteousness of faith (Rom. iv. 13, x. 6), is revealed and realized *ἐκ πίστεως* and *εἰς πίστιν* (Rom. i. 17, in which passage the *δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ* is certainly not meant as an attribute of God,—in this sense it occurs only once, Rom. iii. 26,—but as an attribute of man coming from God). Subjectively considered, it is wrought by faith, and is conferred in faith. As this righteousness does not proceed from the law, it is not brought about by the self-activity of the subject, but through faith, and is conferred as an attribute and a gift; not from merit, or deservedly, but through free divine grace (Eph. ii. 8; Rom. iv. 4; Tit. iii. 5). This righteousness, therefore, is not our own, but the *δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ* (Rom. i. 17, iii. 21 f.), inasmuch as in this pregnant sense it comes from God; and this righteousness is brought about by only one agency, namely, faith in Christ the Saviour (Rom. iii. 21-26).

Where this *δικαιοσύνη* is *genuine*, there is also *life*; and it may readily be shown that in Paul's view this idea of life, or *σωτηρία*, is essentially connected with that of *δικαιοσύνη*, so that the one cannot exist without the other. This is clear from various passages (Rom. i. 17, where Paul appeals to Hab. ii. 4, cf. Gal. iii. 11; Rom. viii. 10; Gal. iii. 21; 2 Cor. iii. 4-11; Rom. v. 17 f.). *Δικαιοσύνη* refers to the moral relation of man to God, and exists where man is conformed to this relation. It is, therefore, the contrast to the position of sin; for where sin is, there is death; but where *δικαιοσύνη* takes the place of *ἁμαρτία*, there must be life. In the old covenant, the subject met with his acknowledgment subjectively

in the conscience, and objectively in the law and its promises; in the new covenant, subjectively also in the conscience, but a conscience guided by the Spirit (Rom. viii. 16), and objectively in the divine word of this covenant. The connection between *δικαιοσύνη* and *ζωή* in Paul's view is important, because the idea of the former does not take the lead in all his epistles; on the contrary, where he is not contending with the Pharisaical Judaistic tendency, but with the theosophical notions, the *idea of life* is more prominently brought forward. Nevertheless, even in these epistles, it may be noticed that his idea of life and salvation always has a moral foundation. This is clearly evident in the Epistle to the Ephesians.

Paul's fundamental idea of δικαιοσύνη has its root in the teaching of Jesus, as it is represented chiefly in the Synoptists. The discourses which John has recorded make the idea of *life* the chief point; but in the didactic sphere of the Synoptists, in which we have the discourses of our Lord, the idea of *righteousness* is mainly prominent. We find this surprisingly so in the Sermon on the Mount in Matthew. Paul's fundamental idea may be said to be rooted in the teaching of Jesus, (1.) In the mode in which the Lord Himself deals with it, by both placing it in the foreground, and opposing it to the prevailing idea of a righteousness which was merely external and depending on personal action (Matt. vi. 33, v. 20, 6; Luke xviii. 9). He represented righteousness as the chief aim of all spiritual striving, and as something which must be received as a gift (Matt. v. 6). To the self-righteous He showed that man could not be justified except by means of repentance and a longing desire for the pardoning grace of God (Luke xvi. 15, xviii. 14). (2.) With this is connected the moral spirit of Jesus' teaching generally. He understood the relation of men to God as a moral one, depending upon the fact whether a man is just before God; and He teaches of a redemption in the moral sense of the word, a redemption from sin and death, by which a man cannot be just before God in his own power, but only through redeeming grace,—a truth to which many of the anti-Pharisaical utterances of Jesus refer, and specially many of the elements of the Gospel of Luke (cf. Luke xv.). It is therefore an incorrect assumption that the Synoptists teach a righteousness of works.

In the same respect, the fundamental idea of *δικαιοσύνη* is characteristically demonstrative of the moral spirit of Paul, as

distinguished from a teaching of a merely speculative character, and one depending on self-righteousness. This moral spirit shows itself where subjective religiousness and salvation, as the result of redemption, are comprehended in the main idea of *life*; for everywhere where this is done, by Paul or other New Testament authors, this ζωή is always understood as an ethical ζωή. But Paul develops the proposition with special clearness, that ζωή can exist only where there is δικαιοσύνη. He speaks of a δικαίωσις ζωῆς (Rom. v. 18); and the result of the redeeming grace, which confers the gift of δικαιοσύνη, is briefly called by him ζωή (Rom. v. 21).

Henceforth the Pauline representation of Christian truth may be divided into two sections: the former relates to the want of δικαιοσύνη in all men, so far as it is judged by itself, and according to the scale of the law; the second refers to the bringing about of δικαιοσύνη by means of faith in Jesus Christ. In the first part is contained the teaching about sin as the condition of man which is opposed to δικαιοσύνη and ζωή; in the second, we have the teaching as to salvation. From this follows instruction as to Christ the Mediator of salvation and the δικαιοσύνη brought about by Him, as referring both to individual believers and to the whole body of them, and as to its completion.

§ 75. *The Lack of Righteousness in all Men—The Fact of this Want.*

The proof that all men are wanting in δικαιοσύνη is carefully brought forward by Paul in ch. i. 18, iii. 20, of the Epistle to the Romans, in reference, first to the Gentiles, and then to the Jews. In regard to both, the actual condition of sin is naturally set forth as a matter of experience. This condition is described, and it is left to every reader to apply this description to his own moral consciousness and his own personal life. On the other hand, in this connection there is not yet any mention made of the sinful propensity from which all actual sin proceeds. Actual sin is first made evident in the conscience; and by this question of the consciousness of actual sin and guilt Paul grasps his readers, in order to convince them of the need of that δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ which is the result, not of individual merit or of the law, but of faith in Christ. The apostle was induced to afford proof as regards both Jew and Gentile, because he wrote to Jewish Christians, or to Gentiles converted by Jewish Christians, and also with the view of laying

down the absoluteness of the gospel in the presence of all other religions.

Paul bases the actually existing moral guilt of the Gentiles on two grounds: (1) The general *revelation of God in His works* (Rom. i. 19 f.), and the way in which the Gentiles acted in respect to it (ver. 21); (2) the *law of conscience*, the moral consciousness existing in every man (Rom. i. 32, ii. 14 f.). Paul says that heavy guilt and liability to punishment are upon these who hinder the truth by unrighteousness (Rom. i. 18), and among these he places the Gentiles. The universal revelation of God was present to those men who have departed from the right knowledge of Him (*ἀλήθεια*); for His invisible nature (ver. 20) has, since the creation of the world, been made perceptible to the mind (the *ἀόρατον* is viewed as *νοούμενον*) by His work, namely, the everlasting power of God, in virtue of which He is exalted over the world as its Creator and Lord, so that men are inexcusable if they act not in conformity to this knowledge. The Gentiles have not obeyed this knowledge, by their deficiency in a feeling of praise and thanksgiving towards God. Because they failed in faithfulness to the truth which they had at their command, the knowledge which they originally had departed; their *καρδιά*, as the centre of moral individuality, was darkened, and they became fools (ver. 22), as a punishment for this self-darkening of the heart. To this follows, further, the wickedness which results from this darkening. God, by way of punishment, allowed their sins to ripen, and gave them over to a reprobate mind, and to the lusts (vers. 24-27) which were followed by all kinds of vices. However deep their degradation, they had nevertheless the law of conscience (ver. 32), and were not without consciousness of the heavy guilt which they thus incurred (cf. Rom. ii. 14 f.), and indeed of the divine judgment of death which followed thereon (i. 32). Because, indeed, God had rendered the knowledge of Him possible for them (vers. 19-23), and they, notwithstanding, had made themselves guilty by idolatry, they were liable to this punishment of God. They, however, bear the guilt of their degradation, not only through their first rejection of the knowledge of God, but also because, with a full consciousness of their liability to punishment, they both commit sins and take a pleasure therein (ver. 22). The way in which Paul here proves the possibility of the knowledge of God to be derived from the works of creation agrees most remarkably

with the apostle's discourses recorded in the Acts, addressed to the inhabitants of Lystra (Acts xiv. 15-17), and to the Athenians (xvii. 24-28).

As regards the guilt of the Jews, in the Epistle to the Romans Paul goes to work in a preparatory way, in order to deprive the Jewish reader of any chance of evasion. He therefore lays down: (1.) That all those who act in the same way as the Gentiles act are worthy of punishment, especially those who have condemned the Gentiles; also, that no one who is impenitent can escape condemnation (Rom. ii. 1-11). (2.) That the possession of a positive law makes no difference to the possessor, except that he will be judged in conformity with the same; "for not the hearers of the law, but the doers, are justified before God" (vers. 12-16). And now the apostle first brings forward his direct accusation against the Jews (vers. 17-24). By breaking the law, the circumcision becomes uncircumcision (vers. 25-29). The Jews have the pre-eminence that to them are committed the oracles of God (Rom. iii. 1-4); but in respect of righteousness before God they have no advantage, for all are under sin (in regard to which Paul refers to passages of the Old Testament), and in the Jews it assumes the form of more conscious sin.

The conclusion to be derived from this course of argument is, that *all men are wanting in righteousness before God* (Rom. iii. 9, 20). In this are involved the main points: (1.) That *all men are sinners*, and consequently the universality of sin in and among men (cf. ch. xi. 22, as the first result of the whole dogmatical portion of the Epistle to the Romans; also Gal. iii. 21; again, Eph. ii. 3). (2.) That, *in respect to God, all men stand in a relation of guilt and liability to punishment*, and are consequently, in default of the divine favour, subject to the righteous judgment of God, and death, the actual punishment of sin (Rom. iii. 9, 23, v. 12, 21). The right of punishment is chiefly denoted by *ὀργή* (Rom. i. 18, ii. 5, 8, iii. 5, ix. 22; Eph. ii. 3, v. 6; 1 Thess. v. 9, cf. i. 10, ii. 16), which in Rom. ii. 5 is combined with *δικαιοκρισία*, the outflow of the *ὀργή*. This expression is taken from the human emotion stirred up against everything which hinders and opposes the human will, and is transferred to God, to describe the opposition of the divine will to everything which hinders and opposes it, consequently to sin. This is both positive, the disapprobation of sin, and also negative, as the want of the

divine favour (Rom. viii. 8, iii. 23). In virtue of His long-suffering and patience, God indeed gives the sinner room for repentance (Rom. ii. 4, ix. 22). The sinner is, however, subject to *θάνατος*, the consequence ordained by God for sin (Rom. vi. 23, i. 32, v. 12–21). It is a *δικαίωμα* of God “that they which commit such things are worthy of death” (Rom. i. 32). In *θάνατος* the idea of physical death is certainly included (Rom. v. 12 ff.),—the sin of the first man being referred to, and the fact that “death reigned from Adam to Moses” being presupposed. This is confirmed by other passages, where Paul expressly includes bodily death (Rom. viii. 10; 1 Cor. xv. 21). But the idea of *θάνατος* is not limited to physical death (Rom. vii. 10 f., 13; Eph. ii. 1, 5; Col. ii. 13; Eph. v. 14); it is rather all the evil which consists in the results of sin, all the misery of sin, both spiritual and bodily, which is comprehended as forming a whole with physical death. Sin and death are everywhere correlatives (1 Cor. xv. 56); and where sin is, there is also death, and the reverse. So that even Christ suffered death on account of sin (Rom. vi. 10),—not His own, but that of others; and that minors dying are not without sin, so far as the latter exists although undeveloped in them.

Certain special questions now arise as to the relation of *θάνατος* to sin. (1.) Death being bodily, how we are to look upon its relation to sin? The idea has frequently been expressed, that, according to Paul, death is only subjectively the result of sin, in regard to the pain and fear of it. Paul certainly makes sin the grievous power of death (1 Cor. xv. 56); and also, in Heb. ii. 15, the slavish fear of death is looked upon as an element in man’s need of redemption. *Θάνατος*, therefore, is modified according to the measure of *ἀμαρτία*. In the immature, death is not to so great an extent combined with the sting to which Paul ascribes to it. Certainly Paul nowhere intimates that man without sin would have remained free from death and change; but, notwithstanding this, the relation of sin to death is not merely a subjective one, and for this view 1 Cor. xv. 47 is appealed to. But although from the beginning Adam’s body was formed of temporal matter, it can hardly be assumed that its absolute mortality is therein expressed; for it is presupposed in Genesis that by means of the fruit of the tree of life this body might be assured against death (Gen. iii. 22). Paul also assumes a twofold mode of

transition from a material to a supernatural life : one by physical death ; the other by means of some sudden change of the mortal into an immortal body in the case of those who belong to Christ,—a change which will take place at the last appearance of Christ with His saints as regards those then living on the earth (1 Cor. xv. 51 f. ; 1 Thess. iv. 17). That which will take place by means of the Saviour might, if man had remained free from sin, have been done without His intervention. If the material matter of the human body can be kept from dissolution and be glorified, how much more readily may it be imagined that, if man had remained free from sin, a glorification, perhaps a gradual glorification, might take place of the psychical body into a spiritual one ! We must also assume that Paul applies his teaching on this point to the person or body of the risen Christ. The sense, therefore, of the Pauline teaching is, that man, *on account of sin, is subject to the separation of soul and body by means of corruption of the body*, and that, in addition, *this death becomes a bitter evil through the consciousness of sin*.

Another question is : (2.) Whether and to what extent Paul includes in *θάνατος* *spiritual death in addition to and with bodily death* ? *Θάνατος* is the contrast to *ζωή*. The latter includes power and activity combined with inward satisfaction, consequently blessedness,—both being in connection with God. *Θάνατος*, so far as it belongs to the spiritual sphere, is the direct contrary to these predicates. It is therefore not merely a feeling of un-blessedness (*Dähne*), and not merely a corruption of the spiritual power (*Usteri*), but both together (Rom. vii. 10–14). Certainly, in 2 Cor. vii. 8 ff., un-blessedness appears chiefly understood by the death which the sorrow of the world brings with it ; but in other passages a slavery to sin forms an element of *θάνατος* (Rom. vi. 16). The whole person is ruled by the lower element of the human nature, so that the man is sold under the power of sin, and is a slave to it (cf. Eph. ii. 1–6, iv. 17–19, 22 ; Rom. i. 21 f., 24, 28), a captive to the *ματαιότης* of the *νοῦς*, the *μωραίνεσθαι τῇ διανοίᾳ*. There is therefore a corruption of the higher powers of man, and also a moral impotence even to do the good which is pleasing to him (Rom. vii. 14 ff.), which impotence he experiences in all its pain and grief. The culmination of *θάνατος* is in Paul, and generally in the New Testament, everlasting destruction, which, in Rom. ii. 12, 16, is described as future, and

appertaining to the day of judgment; in Phil. i. 28 and elsewhere as ἀπώλεια (2 Thess. i. 9; 1 Tim. vi. 9; cf. Rev. ii. 11, xxi. 8), the ὀλεθρος αἰώνιος.

The general expression used by Paul for sin is ἁμαρτία, both actual sin and also the propensity being specified by this term (Rom. v. 12). Actual sinning, in itself, is expressed by ἁμαρτάνειν (Rom. iii. 23, v. 12, 14), and by the nouns ἁμαρτήματα (iii. 25), παράπτωμα as a sin against a definite command or prohibition (Rom. iv. 25, v. 15–20; 2 Cor. v. 19; Gal. vi. 1; Eph. ii. 1, 5; Col. ii. 13), παράβασις as the infringement of a positive command (Rom. iv. 15, ii. 23, v. 14; Gal. iii. 19), ἀπειθεία, disobedience (Rom. xi. 30, 31, 32; Eph. v. 6), παρακοή (Rom. v. 19, cf. vi. 16), ἀδικία (Rom. vi. 13, cf. i. 18). Sin is also a doing, ποιεῖν, πράττειν (Rom. i. 32, ii. 1–3, 17–24), of that which is μὴ καθήκοντος (Rom. i. 28).

Sin, therefore, is in Paul's view nothing else but an *internal, or both internal and external, act of volition in contravention of the law, and in hostile opposition towards God* (Rom. viii. 7). Sin is combined, on the one hand, with guilt before God by virtue of imputation, which, according to Paul, presupposes that the act of volition is not only an act of man, which therefore is imputed to him (Rom. v. 13; cf. Philem. 18), but especially an act which is avoidable by him (Rom. i. 18–23); for man is inexcusable if he commits sin which is avoidable. This act of volition is also committed with a consciousness of the moral law; for the imputation of sin does not exist except the sin be united with this consciousness (Rom. v. 13, iv. 15). Not only is sin united with guilt, but also with liability to punishment before God. Man as a sinner not only lacks the δόξα Θεοῦ, the acknowledgment and glorification which God gives, but, through the opposition of his will to God, he is also subject to the ὀργή Θεοῦ, to the κρίσις Θεοῦ, and consequently the effects of this judgment, to θάνατος and ὀλεθρος. Thus the sinner, who is punishable before God, God imputing sin to him as guilt, is ὑπόδικος τῷ Θεῷ (Rom. iii. 19); he is subject to God's δίκη, the κατάρρα is on him (Gal. iii. 13).

§ 76. *The Lack of Righteousness in all Men—The Cause of this Lack.*

In the Epistle to the Romans Paul enters very essentially into the connection between human sin and the sin of the first man,

but not until he had stirred up in his readers a consciousness of the need of salvation. In the first place, Paul appeals to the experience and conscience of individuals in respect of sin. But after stirring up his readers to consciousness of sin, and setting forth (Rom. iii. 21—ch. v.) the *δικαιοσύνη* which depends on faith in Christ, he compares Christ with Adam, and so leads on to the connection between human sin and that of the first man; also with the innate propensity which cannot be subdued under the law, but is overcome by the fellowship with Christ through the power which proceeds from Him. The other epistles only presuppose this line of teaching.

In Rom. v. 12–21 the idea is enlarged upon, and in 1 Cor. xv. 21 f., 47–49, it is intimated *that the universality of sin and death among men stands in original connection with the sin of the first man*. In the latter passage the view of the apostle is directed only towards the death, and not towards the sin of man; and even in the former passage Paul at first brings forward death more prominently than sin, because death can be more evidently shown to have proceeded from the first man, than that from him sin came upon all men. Paul therefore commences with the former, but thereon grounds the teaching that death, by means of sin, has come upon and spread among mankind, and that in Christ, and by means of *δικαιοσύνη*, *ζωή* has presented itself in the place of death. The whole passage makes a comparison between Christ and the first man in respect to the first results which flowed from each, which result, however, in both cases extended to the whole of mankind. Preliminarily only, the first object of comparison is mentioned (ver. 12), and is then enlarged upon (vers. 13, 14); then the second object is hinted at at the conclusion of ver. 14 (cf. 1 Cor. xv. 45), but not expressly stated. In vers. 15–17 Paul does not proceed to bring forward the difference which exists between the two objects of comparison, until finally, in vers. 18, 19, both are placed positively side by side. What follows in vers. 20, 21, concerns the relation of the law to the dominion of sin, showing that, so far from the law having removed the condition of sin and death which had been established and spread among mankind by means of the first man, it had, on the contrary, been more fully developed by means of the law. Verse 12 sets forth the two main propositions with regard to sin and death, and begins: *Διὰ τοῦτο, because therefore* (according to what has

gone before, vers. 9–11 and 1–5), we, through Jesus Christ our Lord, who died and lived again for us, are justified and saved, therefore the case is the same with the origin of sin and death. Through one man has (1) sin come into the world, and death by sin, and (2) in this way has death combined with sin pervaded all mankind.

As regards the origin of sin and death in mankind, the apostle, taking the very commencement of man's history, finds therein neither sin nor death. That, in the apostle's view, sin was not originally in the world, is evident from Rom. i. 19 ff., inasmuch as he represents that a normal development of an original consciousness of God might have been possible, and had been perverted by sin; but through the first man, sin, in the whole purport of its idea, entered εἰς τὸν κόσμον as into an organic whole. Sin first entered into the world as a supplement through one man, inasmuch as he sinned, and not by the fact of his creation (Rom. v. 16). In this passage this idea is incontestable (vers. 16–19); and even in 1 Cor. xv. 47–49 there is but a faint appearance of the contrary view. At first only the contrast between the earthly and glorified body is dealt with; and not merely the expression χοϊκός; but also the contrasts ψυχικός and πνευματικός (ver. 44), refer only to the body. And ψυχὴ ζῶσα (ver. 45) forms a complete contrast to πνεῦμα ζωοποιούν, without any idea of sin being included. It may well be imagined that the first man was not indeed a πνεῦμα ζωοποιούν, but yet might have been capable of a sinless life. And in any case the sinlessness of Christ was something entirely different from the innocence of the first man, which only involved the possibility of a sinless development. Now this first man is Adam (Rom. v. 14; 1 Cor. xv. 22, 45); and through him the sin, which certainly, according to Paul, was first excited in Eve by deceit (2 Cor. xi. 3; 1 Tim. ii. 14), came to its full and free consummation, and was thus a sin common to both. The actual sin of this first man was a παράβασις (Rom. v. 14),—i.e. an infringement of a positive divine command or prohibition,—a παράπτωμα (vers. 15, 17, 18), a παρακοή (ver. 19). By this act sin came into the world. It was not limited to a mere momentary existence in the isolated deed of the first man, but became an agency henceforth existing in man; for not only had it come into the world, εἰσῆλθε, but had in a more definite sense, διῆλθε. And the operation of this agency is specially mani-

fest, in that through it death came into the world, and is indeed placed by God in a moral relation with sin (Rom. vi. 23) in virtue of a divine *κρίμα* (ver. 16). Death now came into the world, not as something original in it, but as an active agency, by means of which not only he that first sinned as *ἁμαρτήσας ἀπέθανε* (ver. 14 f.),—death reigned not only over this one man, but *so death united with sin passed upon all men* (ver. 12). The expression *καὶ οὕτως* must be here considered. As death entered into the world, so it also passed upon all; *εἰς πάντας διήλθεν* is not identical with *εἰς τὸν κόσμον εἰσῆλθεν*. *Κόσμος* represents, indeed, the whole of humanity; but the distinction between the two ideas is that *κόσμος* denotes mankind as a general idea, whilst *πάντες ἄνθρωποι* expresses every individual comprehended in this glance. Sin and death had by one man entered among mankind as a whole, but they had not yet passed upon all the individual members of mankind. The latter is a matter of successive development. Death has, however, passed upon or pervaded all men, *just as and after* it had entered the world; *because* it had previously entered among mankind as an agency, it successively passed upon every individual. But death was originally caused by the sin of the first man, and has come upon all men, not only because it had generally entered the world, but it has *so* passed upon all as it first entered, namely, *by means of sin*. This is particularly expressed in the addition *ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον*. This evidently speaks of the relation between sin and the general spread of death. The question now arises, how this *ἐφ' ᾧ* is to be explained. In the first, it may be taken either as a conjunction or preposition; and in the latter case, a subject for the relative is to be sought for. From ancient times the former course has been most frequently taken, and *ἐφ' ᾧ* has been understood as = *ἐπὶ τοιῷτι ὅτι* = *propterea quod* = *because*. But this interpretation is not only scarcely justifiable in a grammatical point of view, but the context is most decidedly against it; for it is unmistakeable that the universality of death is here intended to appear as the result of the first sin (ver. 15), and not of the sinning of every individual. At the very most might the sin of the individual be considered as the secondary cause of the general death which, in the primary instance, had been brought in by the sin of the first man; and this would only tend to weaken the main idea. Augustine was guided by a correct feeling when, in consequence

of his impression of the whole passage, he sought to find a subject to the relative ἐφ' ᾧ, and believed this to be the first man, explaining the words "in quo omnes peccaverunt." But from the context it is evident that it is not intended that Adam's sin was imputed to us. No imputation of sinful propensity is spoken of; indeed, with regard even to actual sin, no imputation exists, except only where a positive law exists (ver. 13). It is set forth that, notwithstanding this, the death which proceeded from the first sin spread universally over all, those even who had not, like Adam, infringed a positive law,—that is, the whole world between Adam and Moses. This took place through a κρίμα (judicial sentence), which was for all men a κατάκριμα (a condemnatory sentence) (vers. 16, 18),—a divine judgment which so ordained it, not, however, by imputing Adam's sin to every individual, but as a natural result, a natural necessity proceeding from this judgment (ver. 15). Those explanations which take ἐφ' ᾧ as a relative, and refer this relative to the whole of the preceding sentence, or to θάνατος, are therefore more in consonance with the right understanding of the connection. But there is more probability in the view that ἐφ' ᾧ is to be taken as a conjunction, and to be interpreted ἐπὶ τούτῳ ὥστε, on the understanding that all have sinned; so that the actual sin of individuals is a consequence of the same event owing to which death through Adam's sin was spread among mankind. The sin of Adam has therefore brought on the sin of all other men inseparably from death. The power of sin is, however, so great, that, on the one hand, where it is committed without any positive law, it brings with it death (ver. 14), although the sin is not properly imputable; and, on the other hand, the moral law could not stop it, but, as a positive law, has only enhanced it (ver. 26).

We are thus led to the other aspect of the question, in which the sin of individual men is not merely and directly connected with that of Adam, but also with a *sinful propensity* which, in *every individual* descended from the first man, *precedes all actual sin*. This doctrine is intimated in the passage we have considered (Rom. v. 12 ff.), the idea being expressed, that sin through the first man came into the world as a continuous principle. We have, however, only the general definition, that this takes place in consequence of a divine κρίμα, and that it is no imputation, properly speaking. The nature of this dominion of sin, as a pro-

propensity which precedes all actual sin, is developed more in detail in Rom. vii., where the relation of man to the law is in the first place set forth, first of the natural man (*ἐν σαρκί*, ver. 5), next of man made a partaker of the grace in Christ, who is no longer *ἐν σαρκί* but *ἐν πνεύματι* (ver. 6). The former is enlarged upon in vers. 7–25, the latter in ch. viii. 1–17. *Ἀμαρτία* no longer appears in its general idea as in ch. v. 12–21, where it signifies both the propensity and also the actual sin; but, as the apostle now reverts to the root, it is sin as a power, as a propensity, from which all actual sin is formed.

As regards the existence of this propensity, Paul says (Rom. vii. 7): “I had not known sin, but by the law;” and in ver. 8: “Sin, taking occasion (for its self-development) from the law, wrought in me *πάσαν ἐπιθυμίαν*.” The *ἐπιθυμία* is therefore the effect of *ἀμαρτία*. The teaching of Paul, so far, goes further than the doctrines of sin as we found them in James and Peter. The *ἀμαρτία* exists potentially in man, but as *ἀμαρτία νεκρά*, until there is a consciousness of the law. Then sin becomes active; it revives and brings about death (ver. 10). Sin appears here as a germ which is developed by means of the moral consciousness; it is a controlling power—*νόμος ἀμαρτίας* (ver. 23). This sinful propensity has a continuous existence in individuals—*ἡ οἰκοῦσα ἐν ἐμοὶ ἀμαρτία* (vers. 17, 20),—and is therefore an habitual propensity, and (as results from our previous consideration) it dwells in man even before the consciousness of the moral law arises in him. The man experiences this sinful propensity when the moral consciousness awakens in him as an inclination to good, but he finds that evil is present with him (ver. 21). As to the entry of this propensity into mankind, nothing is said here; but from Rom. v. 12 we may supply the cause—through the sin of the first man. The essential character of this propensity is *opposition to the moral law* (Rom. vii. 23), and to the *πνεῦμα* (Gal. v. 17), and includes a hostile striving against God (Rom. viii. 7), to whom this propensity cannot be subject. It is so powerful in man, that so long as no higher principle than the law is living and active in the subject, it does not allow the honest will of man either to overcome the dominion of sin or to get rid of the dissension in himself. This agrees with what we read in ch. v. The power of the sin which passed from the first man to others is so great, that the moral law in itself is not able to do

away with it; on the contrary, the positive law only increases it. This propensity is, however, not so constituted, or so powerful, that nothing more than it exists in the natural man. These are the main features of Paul's teaching as to a sinful propensity. In more closely analysing it, we have to consider its *nature*, its *seat*, and its *development*.

We will first consider the *nature* and the *seat* of this propensity. The *ἀμαρτία* is in the *σὰρξ* of man (Rom. vii. 18, 25); it dwells in the members (Rom. vii. 5, 23), and therefore the body is called the *σῶμα τοῦ θανάτου τούτου* (Rom. vii. 24), *σῶμα ἀμαρτίας* (Rom. vi. 6, cf. 12), *σῶμα τῆς σαρκός* (Col. ii. 11), and *σὰρξ ἀμαρτίας* (Rom. viii. 3), in contrast to a morally guiltless *σὰρξ*. Whosoever is ruled by this propensity is *κατὰ σάρκα* (Rom. viii. 5), *ἐν σαρκί* (Rom. viii. 8, 9), *τὰ τῆς σαρκὸς φρονῶν* (Rom. viii. 5), *κατὰ σάρκα περιπατῶν* (Rom. viii. 4), generally *σαρκικός* (1 Cor. iii. 3) or *σάρκινος* (Rom. vii. 14; 1 Cor. iii. 1). The mind which is actuated by this propensity is *φρόνημα τῆς σαρκὸς* (Rom. viii. 6, 7), and the acts resulting therefrom are *ἔργα τῆς σαρκὸς* (Gal. v. 19). This propensity is opposed to the *νόμος τοῦ νοός μου* (Rom. vii. 23), to the divine law as it exists in the consciousness of the natural man, the *ἔσω ἄνθρωπος* (Rom. vii. 22), or to the *πνεῦμα* (Rom. viii. 6–9, cf. vii. 14; Gal. v. 16–22, vi. 8).

In Rom. vii., from ver. 7 onwards, Paul speaks of the natural man, who is in possession of nothing higher than the natural and Old Testament law. Not until ch. viii. does he speak of the man who is renewed in Christ, and in Him is in possession of the *πνεῦμα*. Up to that point, that is, in ch. vii. 7–25, the natural man is the subject, so far, however, as he is under the positive law. The *σὰρξ* forms here a contrast to the *νοῦς*, which becomes conscious of the divine law. Only in the Christian subject is the contrast formed by *τὸ πνεῦμα*. The latter abides only in the believer who is in fellowship of life with Christ, and is also a new man, and denotes in an objective sense the Spirit of God or Christ (Rom. viii. 9, 11, 16; Gal. iv. 6; 1 Cor. ii. 10–12), but in a subjective sense the human mind in its highest stage of potency, but only so far as the Spirit of God dwells in and actuates it (Rom. viii. 16, cf. xiv. 9). In other passages also, wherever Paul ascribes the *πνεῦμα* to men, he always presupposes that they are believers; and therefore in Rom. vii. 7–25 he does

not mention the *πνεῦμα*, because he is there considering the propensity to sin existing in the natural man as placed in antagonism to the *νοῦς* only. In Paul's view, *νοῦς* is the human mind, self-conscious sometimes in a theoretical, and sometimes in a practical direction. It is indeed active in the regenerate (1 Cor. xiv. 14 f.), but not in believers alone, but likewise also in the natural man, who, by means of his *νοῦς*, can become conscious of God (Rom. i. 20), and is conscious of the divine law (Rom. vii. 23); but, on the other hand, the darkening of this *νοῦς* is set forth (Rom. i. 21; 2 Cor. iv. 4; Eph. iv. 18), that it sinks into a *ματαιότης* (in contrast to *ἀλήθεια*, Eph. iv. 17), that it becomes *ἀδόκιμος* (Rom. i. 28), and a fleshly *νοῦς* (Col. ii. 18), in which case an *ἀνακαίνωσις τοῦ νοῦς* is necessary (Rom. xii. 2), through the *πνεῦμα τοῦ νοῦς ἡμῶν* (Eph. iv. 23). The *ἀμαρτία*, however, dwells *ἐν τοῖς μέλεσι*, in the body and not in the *νοῦς* (Rom. vii. 23). But Paul sometimes so expresses himself that it appears as if he intended to identify the *ψυχὴ* with the propensity. The man who is the contrast to the spiritual man is called the *ψυχικός ἄνθρωπος* (1 Cor. ii. 14; cf. Jas. iii. 15; Jude 19), being ruled by the mere *ψυχὴ*, in distinction from the *πνεῦμα*. But the *σὰρξ* is, in the first place, the *body having life*, and is quickened and animated by the *ψυχὴ*. Man, therefore, as a *ψυχὴ ζῶσα* (1 Cor. xv. 45), is the man who has a *σῶμα ψυχικόν* (ver. 44). There is consequently no cause for surprise at Paul, when calling the natural man *σαρκικός*, also describing him as *ψυχικός*; for the *ψυχὴ* introduces into the *σῶμα* and the *μέλη* no new principle whereby they cease to be *σὰρξ*. On the contrary, it merely animates the body, and in its immediate connection with the body must develop a morally unhealthy life. Thus the proposition holds good, that *ἀμαρτία, as a propensity, has its seat in the body and in the members, so far as this body is an animated one*, and that no newer and higher principle enters man so long as he is without the *πνεῦμα*.

But this proposition does not assert (1) that Paul looked upon the bodily element as in itself sinful; for, in the apostle's view, sin entered into the world through disobedience (Rom. v. 12 ff.), whilst, from the very first, man was of course possessed of an animal body (1 Cor. xv. 46). Neither enjoyments nor actions are immoral because they are corporeal; for Paul expressly blames as unchristian that austerity towards the body which would aim

at deadening it (Col. ii. 23 ; 1 Tim. iv. 1-5). He, on the contrary, considers every enjoyment which is permitted by the Christian consciousness to be good and right (Rom. xiv. 6 ; 1 Tim. iv. 4, 5). He requires a care for the body, certainly within certain prescribed limits (Rom. xiv. 6),—a care which nourishes the powers of life without exciting impure lusts ; and he also demands that the body should be dedicated as a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable to God (Rom. xii. 1). (2) Also it is not asserted by the apostle that the sinful element appears to him to be merely something corporeal in its nature, and that every sinful impulse is derived from the body. We may notice, on the one hand, that with the most acute knowledge of mankind and the purest moral ideas, he recognises as sin not only the merely sensual emotions, but also those thoughts and actions which are not explicable by any corporeal impulse, such as the antichristian self-deification, which elevated itself above all that was sacred (2 Thess. ii. 4) ; indeed, we see that he represents such thoughts and actions as works of the *σάρξ* (Gal. v. 20), and derives both the errors of the Colossian ascetics (Col. ii. 18), and likewise the divisions in the Corinthian Church (1 Cor. iii. 3 f.), from a *νοῦς τῆς σαρκός*. On the other hand, he comprehends too deeply the contrast between good and evil to derive all sinful impulse from the body merely, following in this the New Testament generally (cf. John xvii. 16, 14, 6, 9 ; 1 John v. 4 ; Jas. i. 27). It is the contrast between God and the world which Paul chiefly sets forth (1 Cor. i. 20-28, ii. 12, iii. 19 ; 2 Cor. vii. 10 ; cf. 1 John ii. 15, 16). He comprises all moral good in the love of God (Rom. viii. 28) ; and what Christians are to renounce consists of ungodliness and worldly lusts (Tit. ii. 12). From this contrast results the other between the personal I and God and Christ,—a contrast which Paul lays much stress upon, according to which the evil consists in a man “living to himself” (2 Cor. v. 15 ; cf. Rom. xiv. 7 f. ; Gal. ii. 20). It is evident that the apostle has deeply recognised the selfish principle in sin, and has this in view when he places the existence of sin in the *σάρξ*.

All these points are against the idea that Paul derived the impulse to sin from the body alone ; and the passages, Rom. vii. 5, 23, 24, Gal. v. 19, where he appears to speak only of the sins of the body, are no proof in its favour. There is, of course, a whole class of sins, more or less gross in character, which take

their rise in bodily impulses, as soon, namely, as the corporeal nature enters the service of selfishness; and the bodily desires have been also from the very first a certain excitement to selfishness. Certainly Paul says, "In my flesh dwelleth no good thing" (Rom. vii. 18); he also describes the law which prevails in his members as a law of sin. But this he may do without in any way identifying with each other the sinful and the bodily, or considering the sinful as something *merely* bodily; because (1) it is in the body that the selfish propensity which opposes the divine will arises first and with peculiar power, and to the body it most continuously clings; (2) because this propensity generally agrees with the bodily impulse in being directed towards that which most pleases the individual, and in turning away from that which the individual does not desire. This propensity itself is therefore called *σὰρξ*, and the emotions and actions which spring from it the *ἔργα τῆς σαρκός* (Gal. v. 19).

Σὰρξ is, first of all, the flesh properly so called in contrast to the bones (Eph. v. 30), and to the blood (1 Cor. xv. 50; Eph. vi. 12); next, by a synecdoche, it means the whole body (1 Cor. xv. 39), particularly of man (Col. ii. 5; Eph. v. 29, cf. ii. 11; Rom. xiii. 14; 2 Cor. iv. 11, vii. 1). Hence *σὰρξ* becomes further the whole living being, the man, and *πᾶσα σὰρξ* is equivalent to all men (Rom. iii. 20; 1 Cor. i. 29; cf. Ps. lxxv. 1; Gal. i. 16; Eph. vi. 12). But the accessory idea of weakness is for the most part joined with it (Rom. iii. 20; cf. Gen. vi. 3); and hence are derived the other, and for the most part metaphorical, definitions of the idea. Thus *σὰρξ* means that which is outward in contrast to that which is inward (2 Cor. v. 16, xi. 18; Phil. iii. 3); also that which is inferior in power, duration, or value, and therefore perishable and decaying (2 Cor. x. 3, 4; cf. Ps. lxxviii. 39; Isa. xl. 6; Heb. vii. 16; 1 Pet. i. 24); likewise the merely human in contrast to the supernatural (2 Cor. x. 4; 1 Cor. iii. 3; 2 Cor. i. 12; 1 Cor. i. 26; cf. John iii. and the comparison of *σὰρξ* and *αἷμα*, Gal. i. 16; Eph. vi. 12; Matt. xvi. 17). Finally, it includes the signification of that which is sinful, as contrasted with moral good, existing both in the *νοῦς* (Rom. vii. 23, 25) and also in the *πνεῦμα* (Rom. viii. 1-9, 12-16; John iii. 6). Thus because *σὰρξ* generally describes man in his inferior and transitory side, which is foreign and opposed to God, it seems the natural designation for the seat of the sinful propensity; in the *σὰρξ*

sin shows itself with peculiar force and continuance, although all sin is not of a bodily nature.

It is in favour of this conception of Paul's idea of the *σὰρξ* that the apostle, as remarked above, appears, according to 1 Cor. ii. 14, to place sin in the *ψυχή*. The *ψυχή*, as the psychical principle,—the spiritual principle in immediate connection with the body,—is a contrast to the *πνεῦμα* in its highest potency. It is therefore also the side peculiarly belonging to self in the life of man; and as the man in whom the *σὰρξ* rules is therefore *ψυχικός*, it is supposed that the nature of sin is peculiarly belonging to self, in that it is sensual. This idea of the sinful propensity as *σὰρξ* further explains the connection between sin and death. We thus understand how death is an inherited evil, and how the principle of *ἁμαρτία* through Adam's sin clings pre-eminently to the body, and must be connected in a peculiar way with the propagation of life, although the latter idea is nowhere so expressly intimated by Paul as it is in John iii. 6. This propensity to sin develops (Rom. vii. 14) a power which results in a complete slavery (vers. 15–25). Evil becomes a law (*νόμος*) for the unregenerate man; at the best there is but an inward although impotent inclination towards the law (Rom. ii. 17; Eph. iv. 14). Nevertheless, by the side of this propensity the higher tendency in man always remains, not only where the Mosaic law rules (Rom. vii.), but also where the purely natural consciousness of God (Rom. i.) rules in us as a moral law, as among the Gentiles (Rom. ii. 14), in conformity to the relationship to God which is in us (Acts xvii. 28). In both cases the *νοῦς* of the inner man is opposed to sin; but it goes not further than a pleasure in good and a hatred of evil. That which is good does not pervade the man, and he remains the slave of his propensity; some good actions may be done (Rom. ii. 14), but good never becomes the principle of life.

The development of the propensity takes place by means of the law (Rom. vii. 7–15). So soon as man is conscious of the law, whether a positive law or not (Rom. ii. 14 f.), the propensity is developed in its opposition to the divine will contained in the law. The *ἁμαρτία* in itself previously exists in the *σὰρξ*, but only in the *ἐπιθυμία* does it become a matter of fact which can be experienced, therefore in the face of and through the law. It was only undeveloped, *νεκρά*, but now has become active. It is therefore neither kept back nor hindered by the moral law, but

rather stirred up to desire and action ; next, unblestness develops itself both externally and internally, or, in other words, *θάνατος* comes (Rom. vii. 13). In this sense Paul speaks of the *παθήματα τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν τὰ διὰ τοῦ νομοῦ* (Rom. vii. 5), and says that "the strength of sin is the law" (1 Cor. xv. 56), and that "without the law sin were dead" (Rom. vii. 8). The development of the consciousness of the moral law increasing together with this propensity, not only as an idea and conception of the law, but as a delight in it appearing in the inner man (ver. 22), and even as a kind of *θέλειν* (vers. 15, 16, 18, 21), only the more excites a contest between the inward man and the propensity, and renders the man the more conscious of the unhappy result of this contest (vers. 15-23),—the slavery to sin. For in this case the subject (1) is conscious of his subordination to the divine law, and of his inability to fulfil it, because his will is in slavery to the propensity to sin, and is "sold under sin" (ver. 14) ; (2) he is conscious of his subjection to the evil propensity, and is unable to give himself up to it unreservedly, because the consciousness of the moral law warns him therefrom. Thus the individual now stands between these two opposites, gradually becoming fully conscious of his misery, and that he is unable to rescue himself from this position ; and so, by means of the law, the highest thing which is possessed by man at this stage, the *ἁμαρτία* appears both in its whole power, and also in its detestable character and unblestness (Rom. vii. 13, v. 20). If the development of the propensity is more closely considered, it is found to be partly individual in the personal life of each, and partly following the type of a life common to all.

Firstly, the sinful propensity is developed *in individuals* according to the power and circumstances of each,—especially, however, according to the conscientiousness with which each applies the means of help which are at his command. There is thus established a moral difference between individuals ; and even in a merely natural sphere of action there are some better and some worse, some comparatively righteous and conscientious, and some wicked and unconscientious. But even among the better sort there is not one who, by strict conscientiousness, had developed his morality to so great an extent as might have been possible in spite even of his sinful propensity ; and so far all are inexcusable (Rom. i. 20, ii. 1, 15 ff.). And even in the best case,

where there is the most sincere zeal for the law (Rom. vii. 14-25), man cannot get over the contest between the *νοῦς* and the *σάρξ*, between the slavish service of the law as regards the *νοῦς* and the service of sin as regards the *σάρξ*,—there still remains an impotent will and an overpowering propensity. The man remains between the attractive power of the divine law, which works upon the will as the *νόμος τοῦ νοός*, and the influence of evil, which, in spite of his *θέλειν*, he cannot overcome. There is a certain *δουλεύειν νόμῳ Θεοῦ* (ver. 25), but only as accompanied by the actual committing of *ἁμαρτία*; therefore he remains *ταλαίπωρος*, a miserable, wretched man, in need of deliverance from this position (ver. 24).

This propensity is also developed according to the type of a life which is in common. Paul here distinguishes a twofold sphere, that of the Greeks and the Jews. Among the former immorality reigned, owing both to the suppression of the original consciousness of God and moral feeling, and also through sensual excess; among them, therefore, there is *ἄγνοια* in respect to that which is divine and moral (Eph. iv. 17-19; Rom. i. 21 ff.; Acts xvii. 30). They can no longer *δοκιμάζειν* that which is moral, and their wisdom is darkened (Rom. i. 22; 1 Cor. i. 22). In the Jewish community the *δοκιμάζειν* exists in consequence of the positive law (Rom. ii. 17 f.), also a knowledge of the true God as a result of the theocratical revelation. Sin shows itself here chiefly as an adherence to the merely outward form of the law and theocracy, and in a mere outward observance of the positive precepts without any true life. There is therefore a glaring and offensive contrast between the moral knowledge and feeling and action, so that that which is looked upon as the national glory is practically denied. Certain obstinate Jews desire to assert their own righteousness in opposition to the gospel (Rom. x. 3, ix. 31, 32); but, with all their zeal, they fail in attaining salvation. All the various types of collective life of nations and ages are united in the one great community of mankind, arising from the connection with the first man, which is common to all. This collective life of mankind is, however, divided into two essentially different divisions: the first, formed by a common connection with the first man apart from any transformation by Christ, is *the community of sin and death* (Rom. v. 12-21; 1 Cor. xv. 22); the second is mankind as transformed by Christ,—a

community of righteousness and life (Rom. v. 21; 1 Cor. xv. 49, 22). In the first point of view, the community of mankind is the *κόσμος*, sometimes taken in its dominion over, sometimes in its juxtaposition and contest with, the second division, and sometimes as conquered by the latter; therefore the term *κόσμος* sometimes alternates, sometimes is combined with the term *αἰὼν οὗτος* (Rom. xii. 2; 1 Cor. ii. 6, 8), *ἐνεστὼς αἰὼν πονηρός* (Gal. i. 4), *ὁ αἰὼν τοῦ κόσμου τούτου* (Eph. ii. 2). The term *κόσμος* involves the view of the unconditional dominion of sin; in the idea of the *αἰὼν*, which is contrasted with another, we have its qualification and limitation.

The passage Eph. ii. 2 f. is thus to be understood. The sinful community of mankind is connected by Paul, as in the Holy Scriptures generally, with a sphere of sin spreading over mankind, — a spiritual world of wickedness. Where Paul deals with sin in connection with the doctrine of *δικαιοσύνη*, he does not, indeed, specially enter upon the subject of this kingdom of darkness. On the other hand, in the Epistle to the Corinthians we find much on this subject; also in the Epistles to the Colossians and Ephesians, and that to the Thessalonians.

In the first dogmatical portion of the Epistle to the Ephesians (ch. i.-iii.), Paul first considers salvation in Christ only in a general point of view (ch. i. 3-14). After an expression of thanks (ver. 3), he brings forward the divine counsel as shown in the choice (vers. 4-6), and the communication of the benefits of salvation depending thereon. He is led by the progress of his subject to show what the power of God in Christ had done both for his readers and likewise other believers, and, calling attention to their previous pre-Christian position, summons them to a comparison between their former heathen and now Christian position. In ch. ii. 2 ff. we have a brief and comprehensive description of the entire Pauline idea of sin. All men were in a position of death by means of sin (ver. 1): in this they once walked ere they were converted to Christ (ver. 2). Sin was the ruling principle of their moral conduct, and (ver. 3) the lusts and desires springing from the sinful propensity were the element in which they lived; but in these lusts and desires a distinction is made between the strivings of the *σὰρξ* and of the mind. According to this, all would be of an individual character; but in ver. 2 a more universal type is named. The conduct of individuals is

limited by the period of the world, consequently by the spirit of the age—the moral state and customs of this world. This spirit of the age has also another rule—the prince of the power of the air, the spiritual power which rules in the air (cf. Eph. vi. 12), the habitation of which is the atmosphere and not the earth (cf. § 86). This power is a spiritual power, “which now worketh in the children of disobedience” (Eph. ii. 2), *i.e.* in those who in unbelief oppose the gospel. Thus sin is, on the one hand, a variety of trespasses through which man is subject to death in its manifold significations (ver. 1); and, on the other hand, it exists in a propensity which is manifest in ἐπιθυμίαις (ver. 3), sometimes in the direct workings of the σάρξ, sometimes in those brought about by the mind. The individual sins not only find their cause in an habitual propensity, but they are likewise in connection with an universal rule—the αἰὼν τοῦ κόσμου τούτου,—indeed, with its prince. By means of all this we are τέκνα φύσει ὀργῆς, for sin is not only a position of death as regards men, but is also a position of unblestness and of liability to condemnation. This is the state of men in their pre-Christian condition. As regards the Jews, Paul adds φύσει, *i.e.* in contrast to all that had been done or had taken place from without, consequently in contrast to that which they were through the choice of divine grace. Man, therefore, by virtue of sin is νεκρὸς and a subject of the divine punishment; both δικαιοσύνη and ζωὴ are wanting in him.

§ 77. *The Lack of Righteousness in all Men—The Divine Action in reference to this Lack.*

The divine ὀργή (cf. the τέκνα ὀργῆς, Eph. ii. 3) is revealed by God (Rom. i. 18), although its complete revelation appertains to the last judgment, and is therefore ὀργὴ ἐρχομένη (1 Thess. i. 10; Rom. ii. 5, 8). But there is thus a limitation of the ὀργή by means of the divine patience and long-suffering (Rom. iii. 26, ii. 4). This is an outflow from the richness of the divine goodness (ch. ii. 4), with the intention of giving the sinner time for repentance. God's goodness is, in the first place, of a merely negative character in respiting the punishment, so that the sins committed before Christ are not punished (ch. iii. 25). God, in the first place, passes them over in virtue of His ἀνοχὴ and μακροθυμία. “The times of this ignorance God winked at” (Acts xvii. 30), suffering all the Gentiles “to walk in their own ways”

(Acts xiv. 16), without interfering with any decided judgment. Here and there, however, as is said, Rom. i. 18, the *ὁργή* is actually revealed, as by means of the conscience (Rom. ii. 15, 16). This respite is, however, a limitation of the *ὁργή*, which limitation, inasmuch as it proceeds from *χρηστότης*, aims at the salvation of men, and not merely at a postponement of judgment.

This limitation, therefore, carries with it a *positive* divine action against sin, aiming at the salvation of man even before the appearance of Christ. The starting-point of this divine agency is the original revelation of God instituted at the creation (Rom. i. 19 f.). We here find the assertion carefully set forth: (1.) That even apart from any extraordinary revelation, and in consequence of the circumstances in which he was placed from the beginning, *ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου*, in which also the heathen were, a right knowledge of God was possible for man, *i.e.* one opposed to heathen idolatry; (2.) That this knowledge of God depended, objectively, on God's manifesting action (ver. 19), and, subjectively, not on a material view of God, but on a rational reflection on the divine operations, of which the world is the sum,—external nature and the nature and history of man forming elements of them. By all this the consciousness of God originally established in man is awakened; and the more he makes the contents of the world the subject of reflection, and exercises himself in an honest God-seeking frame of mind, the more powerfully and completely will this knowledge be developed (Acts xvii. 27). By a deficiency in these thoughts the knowledge of God is hindered and religious truth is suppressed (Rom. i. 18, 21). Yet, even at the best, this knowledge was imperfect (cf. 1 Tim. vi. 16), and is spoken of in a comparative sense, as also the statement of the apostle that the heathen fulfil a natural moral law (Rom. ii. 14). As a substratum of the knowledge of God, nature and history are frequently pointed at in the Old Testament, as Ps. xix., cxlv. In the New Testament, too, there are intimations of the same idea (Acts xiv. 15, 16, xvii. 24-29; Matt. vi. 26, 28-30).

But this original knowledge of God certainly has, by the guilt of man, been darkened and perverted in heathenism, the ethico-psychological origin of which is set forth by Paul (Rom. i. 21 ff.): cf. § 75. With the presupposed original revelation of God is connected the divine operation against sin, having as its aim the salvation of man. This is the divine agency as affecting the

world, and directly embracing the whole of humanity,—the operation of God which maintains and rules the world, and guides every development of humanity. Continually, in spite of the prevalence of sin, God has not left Himself without witness as regards men, but has gradually dispersed them over the earth, and has so guided them, that, after they had more or less forgotten Him, they might seek and find Him, who was so near to all, that in Him they lived, and moved, and had their being (Acts xvii. 25–28, xiv. 16 f.).

But God had not restricted Himself to this general course of operation, but assisted it by another line of action at first applied to the Old Testament theocracy. By this a peculiar relation is established between the children of Abraham—those, namely, springing from Jacob or Israel—and God as their covenant God. This relation Paul highly esteems, stating it to be a peculiar pre-eminence (Rom. iii. 1 f., ix. 4 f.). The nation are the children of God (Rom. ix. 4, 5); to them belong the *δόξα* (according to some, the *δόξα Θεοῦ* which dwelt in the temple, but perhaps generally the glory of the theocratical nation), the covenants (the oft-repeated covenant), the giving of the law and the divine service involved in it, the promises combined with it, and the fathers who stood in a close covenant relation to God. All these advantages are (Rom. iii. 2) combined in one, “that unto them were committed the oracles of God.” The highest prerogative is, however, that this nation forms the substratum of the redemption and was the immediate subject of Jesus’ ministry. All these advantages are also hinted at in Eph. ii. 12; and generally they are a subject which the apostle several times expressly dwells upon, as it was necessary for him to analyse the nature of this relation in all respects. In the economy of the covenant relation, the apostle distinctly distinguishes two periods, which are set forth in Gal. iii.

The *pre-Mosaic period is the patriarchal*, depending upon the divine revelation made to the patriarch of the Israelitish people, by which the theocratical relation was established as a relation peculiar to this people. This was done by the divine promise, united with circumcision, as the sign and seal of the covenant (Rom. iv. 13–21; Gal. iii. 16–22; Rom. ix. 4–8 f.). In this pre-Mosaic period the promise was the chief matter; and its purport was, that Abraham was the heir of the world which

should come to him as inheritor, and that mankind should become the children of Abraham. Therein is placed the whole βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ, the Messianic kingdom. All was to devolve upon the seed of Abraham in the first place, and *strictly* on Christ (Gal. iii. 16), the Son being in a wider sense described as heir of all things (Heb. i. 2). The Jews naturally interpreted the κληρονόμος τοῦ κόσμου as a material domination of the whole world by the Jewish nation; but Paul interprets it spiritually, making Abraham "the father of many nations," not merely materially but spiritually, in the fullest sense, through the salvation in Christ, which passed on from Abraham's race to many nations under the condition of faith. The εὐλογία τοῦ Ἀβραάμ is, that all the nations of the earth were to receive a blessing which proceeded from him, and were to rejoice in this blessing. Yet the promise is not a one-sided one on God's part, it is an *agreement* (Gal. iii. 17),—certainly in this passage in a peculiar sense as a *testament*, διαθήκη, cf. ver. 15,—also in the ordinary sense, and even in the plural (Rom. ix. 4), the one theocratical part in the old covenant having been concluded in more than one way, first in the patriarchal and then in the Mosaical period. Even in the patriarchal times the promise was combined with a requisition which was symbolized in circumcision; but the promise was not given on account of circumcision. This is shown by Paul in Rom. iv., thereby removing the scruple against the δικαιοσύνη ἐκ πίστεως which was caused to the Jewishly inclined by the spirit of theocracy, which, depending on the law, made the divine favour consequent on the fulfilment of its commands (Rom. x. 5; Gal. iii. 12). Paul shows that the original foundation of theocracy was not the law, but the promise given to Abraham, and given not on account of any merit of works, but from free grace; and that he, from whom all the theocratical pre-eminence of Israel sprung, received the divine favour on account of his faithful trust in God, essentially in the same way as the Christian attained to δικαιοσύνη, namely, διὰ τῆς πίστεως. Abraham's piety chiefly consisted in his faithful trust. Three great acts of this trustfulness have been recorded: his going out from his fatherland in accordance with the divine summons and promise (Heb. xi. 8–10); his faith in the promise of a son (Heb. xi. 11); and, lastly, his readiness, at the divine direction, to sacrifice this son, on whom the promise of numerous descendants seemed to depend (Heb.

xi. 17-19). God looked upon this faith as something good, as a righteousness well-pleasing to Him; and therefore he is called the friend of God (Jas. ii. 23; Isa. xli. 8; 2 Chron. xx. 7). Abraham's faith, of course, did not relate to justifying grace, but to the God who, from free bounty, granted to him unmerited favour. God's blessing always presupposes God's favour; and even in the Old Testament, as man is always looked upon as a sinner, it involves also the divine forgiveness. Paul expressed himself in this way about Abraham with special reference to the Christian *δικαιοσύνη* and *πίστις*, in order to show that what he asserted in respect to salvation in Christ held good also in Abraham's relation to God, namely, that it depended, not on merit, but on God's grace and man's faith, and included both forgiveness of sins and justification of the sinner before God. Thus does the apostle link on the culminating point of the divine dispensation in Christ to its historical starting-point in Abraham. Paul lays particular stress upon the point that circumcision was not the ground of the acquisition of a special relation to God, but that it was, on the contrary, only the sign and pledge of the relation in which God on other grounds had placed Himself in respect to Abraham and his descendants. Consequently also the first groundwork of the Old Testament dispensation was an act of God's free grace—the free choice of Abraham and his race (cf. Rom. ix. 7-13). It was so perfectly free, that all the children of Abraham and Isaac were not included in this relation,—not on account of any special guilt on their part, but only that the unconditional freeness of divine grace might thus be fully evidenced.

The Mosaical period is described as the *νόμος* (Gal. iii. 17 ff.), in which the circumcision was included. The law contains a series of special divine requisitions, certainly with a promise added, but merely in the sense that salvation belongs only to him who fulfils the whole law (Gal. iii. 12; Rom. x. 5), whilst a curse rests upon every one who continueth not in all things which are written in the law to do them (Gal. iii. 10). The character of this Old Testament dispensation is, according to Paul, strictly divine (Rom. ix. 4). The law was given by God by means of angels, and presented to the people through Moses, a human mediator. That angels ministered in the giving of the law is to be looked upon as an idea generally adopted by the Jews (cf. Acts vii. 53), under the notion that God was profaned by any immediate contact with

the world. This idea of God is not adopted by Paul and Christianity generally; but the intervention of angels in the giving of the law is brought forward by him in order to intimate, taking a standpoint conceded by the Jews, that this institution had at least no pre-eminence over the institution of the promise. The promise was given directly by God Himself; the law was not directly given to the Israelitish people. It is, however, expressly stated in Ex. iii. 2 that the angel of the Lord appeared in the burning bush, but no mention of this is made in the giving of the law. But the law was ordained not only through the ministry of angels, but also by the hand of Moses, a human mediator. The law was directly confided to him as the mediatorial representative of the whole people (cf. Acts vii. 35; Deut. v. 5). The law having been ordained by God, although by the hand of a mediator, to it belongs equally with the promise, but therefore also in necessary agreement with the promise, the character and dignity of a divine institution. In this two points are involved: (1) *Divine glory and inward holiness belong to the law* (Rom. ix. 4; 2 Cor. iii. 7-11). It was a divine revelation, and therefore the divine splendour and fulness of light overspread even Moses; it was a divine lawgiving, and therefore a *δόξα* was its attribute. The law is therefore divinely framed, holy, just, and true (Rom. vii. 12), of a spiritual character (ver. 14), proceeding from God, and aiming at a spiritual life,—he only corresponding to the spirit and sense of the law who has the spiritual circumcision of the heart (Rom. ii. 29). But the law only possesses this divine distinction in that (2) *it harmonizes with the promise*. It cannot be intended to disannul the promise (Gal. iii. 17, cf. vers. 15, 21, 19, 20), for God is one. He it is who hath given both the promise and also the law,—the God, indeed, who is one and without contradiction in Himself. The two institutions must therefore harmonize with each other; and the promise is the much older revelation, having been given 430 years before the law. The law was given for another purpose, *τῶν παραβάσεων χάριν*. Its first aim was to apply a check to sin; but its first result was, that this positive law is infringed. The law therefore became the means of making man conscious of sin, and thus of bringing it to maturity, and of completely developing it. Thus it can be said that the law was added on account of transgression. This, too, agrees with the inner nature of the law,

for the law is not able to give life (ver. 21): if it could, then truly righteousness would come by the law. Consequently the promise is not annulled by the law, the intention of which was not to found a righteousness of the law, the law being to be considered as a *παιδαγωγὸς εἰς Χριστόν*. The position of man, therefore, was not essentially altered by the law. The law was unable to free man from the power of sin and death, for it was hindered and weakened in its effects by man's evil propensity (Rom. viii. 2): it could not *ζωοποιῆσαι* (Gal. iii. 21). So far the law was but a form of religion which was adapted for the immature (Gal. iv. 1-3), and appropriate to the elementary life of mankind still living in sin (ver. 3), and to the poor and weak rudiments of the world (ver. 9; Col. ii. 20). It certainly pointed to something higher and better, thus showing itself to be something of a lower character. Thus it was the *σκιά τῶν μελλόντων* (Col. ii. 17), therefore intended to be temporary, until the seed of Abraham came, to whom the promise was made (Gal. iii. 19), and until the time appointed by the Father (Gal. iv. 2). The law is that which is done away with and disappears (2 Cor. iii. 11) when He shall arrive for whom the promise was intended (Gal. iii. 19), when, instead of sin reigning unto death, grace through Jesus Christ shall appear as the ruling principle in mankind (Rom. v. 21).

Thus even in pre-Christian times there was action on God's part aiming at the salvation of man. Only with reference to this aim, which is pointed at by the law, has God allowed the condition of sin or admitted it into His plan for the world. He has not prevented this condition (Acts xiv. 16), and has even "winked at it" (Acts xvii. 30). He passed over the sins committed during the pre-Christian period (Rom. iii. 25); but only with the intention of doing away with this condition by means of the redemption (Rom. xi. 32), and in the interval to make the law an agent to prepare for the redemption (Gal. iii. 22-25). Certainly sin would thus become more conscious and more developed, but the consciousness of a need of redemption would be simultaneously promoted and animated; and, so far, sin finds a place in God's counsel under the presupposition of redemption.

§ 78. *The Restoration of Righteousness.*

From the last paragraph, we see that Paul, in considering the divine agency as regards man in the guidance of the world, has

referred it all to redemption as its aim and end, and that he has specially set forth how, in the Old Testament dispensation, God promised redemption (Rom. i. 2), previously announced it (Gal. iii. 8; Rom. iv. 23 f.), prefigured it by shadows (Col. ii. 17), and psychologically prepared for it (Gal. iii. 24). But the apostle is not content with the connection established between that which God did in Christ and what preceded it, but, reverting to the last, teaches: (1.) That *God, from eternity, in virtue of His free will of grace, ordained the redemption of man*; His counsel being, indeed, hidden from man (1 Cor. ii. 7 ff.; Rom. xvi. 25; Eph. iii. 9; Col. i. 26), and made manifest but incompletely by the Old Testament promise (Eph. iii. 5; Rom. xvi. 26), being first fully revealed in its actual realization, consequently, through the gospel as the word of this fulfilment (Eph. iii. 5; Col. i. 26; Rom. xvi. 25 f.; 1 Cor. ii. 9 f.). Hence, in the passages quoted, this divine counsel is styled a *μυστήριον* or *μυστήριον τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ* (Eph. i. 9). A *μυστήριον* is not something which is hidden and remains so, but, having been hidden from men, is revealed to them by God. Just as in Rom. xi. 25 one separate point in the divine plan of salvation—the future conversion of Israel to Christ—is styled by Paul a *μυστήριον*; and likewise the statement (1 Cor. xv. 51), “We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed;” so now the whole plan of salvation is thus characterized. This counsel of God is an *eternal* one (Eph. i. 4); and although this verse refers in the first place to the choice of individuals as part-takers in salvation, still, if this choice of individuals existed *πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου*, so also must have existed the *μυστήριον τοῦ θελήματος Θεοῦ* in respect to salvation generally. Paul, then, desires to intimate that redemption in Christ is not of a merely incidental and momentary character, but that it is something which formed an essential part of God’s plan for the world. This *μυστήριον* is made known to us *κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν αὐτοῦ* (Eph. i. 9), which again is according to His free purpose. Both in James and Peter we were referred back to an eternal, divine will (Jas. ii. 5; 1 Pet. i. 2, 20); but in Paul we find a more copious reference both of the general choice and also of the choice of individuals to the eternal counsel of God, and this counsel has its prescribed destination in Christ (Eph. i. 4 f.). That which God has made known to us as to the *μυστήριον τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ* refers to His *οἰκονομία τοῦ πληρώματος τῶν*

καιρῶν (ver. 10), at the date when all the various epochs had come to an end—οἱ καιροί—which God had settled in His eternal will both as to duration and as to the events contained in them. When all these terms had run out, then Christ appeared (Gal. iv. 4), καιροῦς ἰδίοις, *i.e.* at the date which had been ordained as best fitting (Tit. i. 3), κατὰ καιρόν (Rom. v. 6). The divine counsel for the redemption of man has therefore, as a counsel, a reference to Christ, to Him who was to appear at the prescribed date, after all the preceding periods had passed. The counsel goes, indeed, so far as to gather together in Christ all things which are in heaven or earth (Eph. i. 10). This counsel, then, embraces the whole of humanity, the Gentiles no less than the Jews; and it is just this universality which Paul looks upon as a *μυστήριον*, which was indeed intimated in the old covenant, but is revealed completely in the new covenant, in Christ and through Christ (Eph. iii. 6, 8). God is the God of the Gentiles as well as of the Jews (Rom. iii. 29 f.), and Christ as the intercessor is the Lord who is rich to all who call upon Him (Rom. x. 12).

Having thus seen that redemption was the fulfilment of a divine counsel of grace which existed from eternity, which fulfilment was developed organically in the fulness of time, it naturally results that, (2.) *The creative agency of God also bears a reference to redemption.* God's creative agency was also founded on an eternal divine will, and therefore the counsels both of the creation and the redemption of the world are connected together; the created world, being through sin at enmity with God and disunited in itself, is brought back to unity in Christ Jesus. This reference to redemption in the divine creative agency is indubitably set forth in the later Pauline epistles, most of all in Col. i. In this epistle the argument of the apostle is directed against certain theosophico-Judaistic errors, according to which the salvation of men was to be realized through the intervention of some higher spiritual agency, involving, therefore, an improper religious veneration of angels (Col. ii. 18), and combined with this an anti-sensual asceticism as a self-chosen worship of God (ver. 23). These theories, by which the due position of Christ was annulled and the whole nature of Christianity altered, are opposed by Paul, by exalting the greatness of Jesus Christ as the one image of the invisible God, and as the first-born of every creature (Col. i. 15), and entering into a detailed exposition on the point. In his

view, the creation of the world is thus to be looked upon: that everything was created in an inward, essential connection with Christ (*ἐν αὐτῷ*, ver. 16), and indeed both *through* Christ (*δι' αὐτοῦ*) as the instrumental and intervening cause, and also *εἰς αὐτόν*, so that the relation of everything to Him is not merely momentary but continuous, in order that everything shall be in a continual connection with Him, and shall assist in His glorification. The world is therefore, by the creation, placed in this metaphysical relation to Christ; and not only is He the uninterrupted agent in the existence of the world, but He is also, according to Col. i. 18 ff., the head of His body the Church, and through Him everything is reconciled and made one.

The later epistles also express the same ideas, especially the passage 1 Cor. viii. 6. God is represented here as the ultimate supreme cause of all things, and the one Lord Jesus Christ as the intervening cause of everything. Some expositors understand the latter portion of the verse as referring to a *moral* creation. But the context, and the Pauline idea of the *Κύριος*, are not in favour of this interpretation. *Κύριος* has not a mere reference to redemption as the moral redemption; but as, in Paul's view, the redemption itself is not merely a redemption from sin, but also from its consequences, and includes a positive glorification not only of believing humanity, but also of the whole *κτίσις* with which humanity is connected (Rom. viii. 19 ff.), so the Redeemer also is so far Lord, inasmuch as redemption generally, and not only a moral spiritual salvation, is dependent upon Him,—He cannot bring about redemption without being actually Lord of all. According to Paul, He is not only the Lord from heaven (1 Cor. xv. 47), and the Lord of glory (1 Cor. ii. 8), He also, as Redeemer, subdues *πᾶσαν ἀρχὴν καὶ πᾶσαν ἐξουσίαν καὶ δύναμιν*, *i.e.* all might and power which hostilely opposes God in the universe (1 Cor. xv. 24-27), so that God has put all things under Him. As Redeemer, He has risen again, "that He might be Lord both of the dead and living" (Rom. xiv. 9). It is then evident that the term *Κύριος* in the Pauline teaching embraces more than Him merely who brings about moral salvation. Paul presupposes the realization of this moral salvation, but includes the idea that He who brings it about is also the Lord over all. In glancing at the context of the passage 1 Cor. viii. 6, we see that the apostle's view is directed towards the whole world, with

its whole contents, embracing every sphere of life : the question is, whether there is a plurality of *κύριοι* and *θεοὶ* in the world ? And plainly it is not merely the complex of the moral creation which is spoken of, but the complex of all things, the collective existence of the world. This is quite undisputed as regards the first portion of the verse,—how can it be said that, in the second, a worldly existence is not in question ? Essentially the same idea is expressed here as in Col. i. 16, according to which passage the creation of the world stands in relation to Christ and to the work of redemption. Hence Christ is the Mediator of redemption, because He was previously the Agent in the existence of the world.

According to our former paragraph, the *principle of redemption* is the *redeeming grace of God*, which in Jesus Christ presented itself in the fulness of times in man's history. An essential feature here is, that in Adam and his descendants sin was the ruling principle, and as such producing death ; but in the period of redemption grace is the ruling principle, and brings about *δικαιοσύνη* and *ζωὴ αἰώνιος* instead of sin and death, through the intervention of Jesus Christ as our Lord (cf. Rom. v. 15, iii. 24 ; Eph. ii. 8, i. 7 ; Tit. ii. 11). *Χάρις* is God's unmerited goodness towards His creatures, especially towards sinful men. In its more general signification it is expressed by *ἀγάπη* (Rom. v. 8 ; Eph. ii. 4), and by *χρηστότης* (Eph. ii. 7 ; Tit. iii. 4). The term is most closely defined in Tit. ii. 11 : *ἡ χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡ σωτήριος* ; cf. iii. 4 : *χρηστότης καὶ φιλανθρωπία τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Θεοῦ*. "*Ελεος* specially denotes the divine goodness towards the unhappy (Eph. ii. 4 ; Rom. xi. 31, 32). Redemption is expressed by *σῶσαι*, *σωθῆναι* (cf. 1 Tim. i. 15 ; Tit. iii. 5), and hence *σωτηρία* (1 Thess. v. 9). Christ, therefore, is distinctively called *σωτήρ* (2 Tim. i. 10 ; Tit. ii. 13), although in the Pastoral Epistles God is also so called, as the final cause of redemption and the Sender of Jesus Christ (1 Tim. i. 1, ii. 3, iv. 10 ; Tit. iii. 4). The expression *ἀπολύτρωσις*, often used by Paul, denotes the mode of redemption as a *ransoming* (Rom. iii. 24 ; Eph. i. 7). It refers to the liability to punishment, and includes the forgiveness of sins, combining therefore the idea of *σωθῆναι* with the closer definition of a *σωθῆναι ἀπὸ τῆς ὀργῆς* (Rom. v. 9). From what has gone before, we see that, as explained by Paul, redemption is essentially brought about by Christ, and that all that is contained in redemption proceeds from and is grounded in Him, ultimately,

however, of course in God. The Pauline teaching as to the redemption is based, therefore, upon Christ as the Redeemer, and we get the following divisions: (1.) Jesus Christ the Redeemer, His person and office; (2.) Redemption itself as the completed work of Christ; (3.) The reference to God in this teaching as to redemption.

§ 79. *Jesus Christ the Redeemer—His Person.*

In Paul's teaching as to the person of Christ *in general*, he does not place the Christological element in the foreground. We may see how strongly the anthropological element prevails in Paul's views, by noticing how much of the Epistle to the Galatians is devoted to the relation between the law and the gospel, and how little is *ex professo* taught as to the person of Christ (Gal. ii. 20, iv. 1-7). This subject is more dwelt upon in the Epistle to the Romans; but if we consider the extent of its dogmatic exposition, we find the passages relating to the person of Christ are but scanty as compared with the anthropological element. The deficiency in the Christology is nevertheless only comparative, and does not prevent the apostle, who derives all redemption from Christ, from reverting in many instances to His person. And by the fact that Paul always sets this forth as essentially the chief matter (cf. Rom. v. 12-21; 1 Cor. xv.; Rom. viii. 3; Gal. iv. 1-7; Eph. i. 9, 10, 19; Col. i. 13-22), we are justified in giving it the first place in our exposition of his teaching.

Paul also does not omit to adopt into his teaching the chief points of Christ's historical appearance upon earth, including the subsequent exaltation, and asserting for it an essential relation to redemption as the work of Christ in a more complete and detailed mode than Peter's. For whenever Paul derives redemption from Christ, it is always pre-eminently, and almost always expressly, *Jesus Christ, who died, rose again, and is exalted for us*. So absolutely and essentially does Paul combine redemption and the effects of redemption in believers with the person of Christ, that he shows the greatest predilection for uniting it not only with the nature of His person, but also with all the chief phases of His appearance, His lowliness and His exaltation, His sufferings and death. This, and also the fact that Paul had in view to represent the peculiarity of Christianity, and therefore the work of redemption in all its distinction from the Old Testament dispensation, are the causes why he was compelled, more than Peter, to dwell upon the

inner nature of the person of Christ as distinguished from all other men. We have, indeed, found Peter expressing most decisively that Christ is the only sinless One, and the Prince of life; but he does not go beyond this in definite explanation as to the inner nature of the person of Christ. This explanation is exactly what we find in Paul. He desires to represent that it is a general need of mankind that they should be reconciled and redeemed,—a need, indeed, which is satisfied in Christ alone, who is something new and higher as regards both all the descendants of Adam and also the entire universe (the latter idea is chiefly set forth in the Epistle to the Colossians). In contexts of this kind we find the principal Christological references in the Pauline epistles; they are more rare when called forth by special motives (Phil. ii. 4 ff.; 2 Cor. viii. 9; passages in which a practically didactic aim inspires them).

As regards Paul's *special* teaching as to the nature of the person of Christ, its *human* aspect is, in the first place, often brought forward, and Christ is very decidedly considered as man. He is born of woman (Gal. iv. 4); of the theocratic race of Israel, a descendant of David and Abraham (Rom. ix. 3-5, i. 3; 2 Tim. ii. 8; Gal. iii. 16), and therefore made under the law (Gal. iv. 4); living like man upon earth, especially in all human lowliness (Phil. ii. 7, 8; and thus the *σὰρξ* in Rom. i. 3 is to be taken as an expression of the collective existence of mankind); He was crucified (1 Cor. i. 23; 2 Cor. xiii. 4); was dead and buried (1 Cor. xv. 3, 4), and rose again on the third day (1 Cor. xv. 4, both "according to the Scriptures"); He was exalted to heaven at the right hand of God (Rom. viii. 34; Col. iii. 1; Phil. ii. 9-11; Eph. i. 20-22). These points in His earthly life are, however, not mentioned merely as such, but as facts by which redemption was brought about. Very frequently, too, even His human nature and life's history are so mentioned, that it is evident that the apostle desires to describe Him not as mere man, and that humanity is ascribed to Him in a peculiar sense. The appellation of *man* simply is very seldom applied to Christ by Paul. Besides 1 Tim. ii. 5, where the *man Christ Jesus* is mentioned as the Mediator between God and men, we find in the earlier epistles the passage 1 Cor. xv. 21, where, however, the parallel with the first man Adam asserts for Christ a peculiar position as regards the rest of mankind. Therefore in the same connection (vers.

45-49) there is ascribed to Him, as the ἔσχατος Ἀδάμ or δεύτερος ἄνθρωπος, a very essential pre-eminence over Adam the first man. The same relation exists in Rom. v. 15-21, where Adam appears as the τύπος of Christ, both being starting-points of a collective life among mankind. But, on the other hand, vers. 15-17 show, in addition to this similarity, a twofold difference, the contrast presented by the two kinds of collective life, one being destruction, the other being salvation; and also the superiority of the effects produced by Christ. The different causes of these effects are also set forth (sin and grace, ver. 15; judgment and free gift, ver. 16); also the mode of the effect (death and salvation, vers. 15, 17). In all this Christ excels His type. That a mere moral relation is not intended here is evident from a comparison with 1 Cor. xv. 47-49. The first man was a ψυχὴ ζῶσα, but the second Adam is a πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν (ver. 45), and therefore not of earth, but heavenly,—indeed, “the Lord from heaven” (ver. 47). Christ is, too, εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ (2 Cor. iv. 4), so that the glory of God was reflected or manifested in Him (ver. 6); in the midst even of His humiliation, when He was crucified, He was Κύριος τῆς δόξης (1 Cor. ii. 8). Paul, moreover, asserts the absolute sinlessness of the person of Christ: He is ὁ μὴ γνούς ἁμαρτίαν, that is, He had not experience of sin as personal sin in Himself (2 Cor. v. 21; Rom. v. 18; Phil. ii. 6). The δικαίωμα, i.e. the action which through its righteousness supplies the want of another (Rom. v. 18), is perhaps mentioned with special reference to the one action of Christ's death, but so mentioned, that this deed of obedience is considered by Paul as only the culminating point of a whole life lived in complete unbroken obedience towards God (cf. Phil. ii. 8). The idea of sinlessness is also involved in that of a sacrificial offering, which must be faultless, and also in the consideration of Christ as the founder of a new life, free from death; for as death came by sin, so this life must come by its contrary. The Κύριος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, who is the πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν, must therefore be sinless. Sinlessness seems so necessarily united with Paul's idea of Christ, that it may thus be explained why there are so few passages in which he expressly sets it forth. In those passages also where Christ is not spoken of as the first man, Paul supposes some higher element besides the human in the person of Christ. This is specially evident in Rom. i. 3, where Christ is designated the Son of God even in the lower

element of His personality : τοῦ γενομένου ἐκ σπέρματος Δαβὶδ, κατὰ σάρκα (cf. Rom. ix. 5 ; Gal. iv. 4).

As to the human nature of Jesus, the apostle expresses himself with some caution, indeed with a certain amount of restriction. In 1 Tim. iii. 16 it is briefly said of Him, ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί. Here, however, the idea of the σὰρξ denotes the vehicle of the manifestation more than the nature of the person appearing. On the other hand, the expressions in Phil. ii. 7, 8, ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος καὶ σχήματι εὑρεθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος, are of a more cautious character, because He is not merely man, but His becoming man is made a self-renunciation. Paul, however, goes further in Rom. viii. 3 : God sent His Son, not only clad in σὰρξ generally, but more exactly in *a* σάρξ, which is in the likeness of σὰρξ ἁμαρτίας, i.e. is similar to the sin-burdened σὰρξ of existing humanity ; still it is not precisely and simply the same σὰρξ as ours. And its being said that He was μὴ γνοὺς ἁμαρτίαν must be understood as implying that He had not even the ἁμαρτία natural to the σάρξ,—not only that He was without actual sin, but also that σὰρξ which, as we are already aware, is the foundation of all actual ἐπιθυμία and ἁμαρτία.

Another question now arises, which has been lately a subject of discussion. If Christ, although a descendant of Adam κατὰ σάρκα, had not the principle of death in Him, how was it possible for Him to die ? Baur thought that this could only be explained by the presupposition that, however much the ideas of flesh, sin, and death are mutually conditional, yet, on the other hand, the σὰρξ by itself alone may be looked upon as mortal. But, according to Paul, Christ died only on account of sin (Rom. vi. 10). Of course He had not the σὰρξ which is subject to death—the σὰρξ ἁμαρτίας, and therefore also of θανάτου and ταπεινώσεως (Phil. iii. 21). He had put on the σὰρξ only as a ὁμοίωμα σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας (Rom. viii. 3) ; and it would therefore doubtless have been in His power, by means of the principle of life dwelling in Him, to glorify His σὰρξ without dying, just as it was afterwards glorified by His death and resurrection. His not having done this forms an element in His self-renunciation and humiliation : in this point, of His own free will He made Himself equal to us, and by His voluntary death placed His σὰρξ in a relation to sin and death which in itself it did not intrinsically possess.

We still have to discuss the idea of the σὰρξ in the person of

Jesus, with reference to certain opinions which have been expressed on the subject. It has been thought (Zeller, *Theol. Jahrb.* i. 1) that the *σάρξ*, which is of course most usually named when the incarnation even of the higher principle is spoken of, is to be taken in a quite exclusive sense, and that therefore a mere human corporeality is to be ascribed to Christ, to the exclusion of a human soul. This idea is thought to apply to the New Testament generally, but especially to the teaching of Paul. In opposition to this opinion, it may be said, as is in fact allowed, that the idea of the *σὰρξ* is of a far more comprehensive character, and is in no way limited to the mere body, but includes human nature generally, expressing as it does the whole idea of man's sinful nature. At all events, therefore, the *σὰρξ* may be understood more comprehensively. But this comprehension becomes almost a certainty when we notice how, in Paul's view, corporeality is always considered as inseparable from the *ψυχή*, that *σῶμα* as *σῶμα* is also *ψυχικόν* (1 Cor. xv. 44), and that the *ψυχὴ ζῶσα* is placed with it (ver. 45; cf. Rom. iii. 20). This is so invariably the case, that the idea *σαρκικός* in the sense of *sinful* includes in itself the idea *ψυχικός*. An appeal has further been made to the complete harmony between this idea of Christ's assumed humanity being mere corporeality and the work of redemption. It is said that, in Paul's view, redemption consists in the *σάρξ*, as the principle of sin, being deprived of its power by the death of Christ, and that the work of redemption was, consequently, merely the laying down of the bodily life. But, in the first place, redemption includes another essential, which leads us much further, viz. the spiritual regeneration which is followed by the bodily glorification. But even the death of Christ in itself presupposes something further, as its redeeming character must certainly consist in something more than the mere putting an end to a *σάρξ*: it must, on the contrary, be a moral action which requires a spiritual principle in the nature of the incarnate One which is susceptible of obedience. His work appears to have been an act of moral obedience of this kind (Rom. v. 18 ff.; Phil. ii. 8). What He must have been for this end is expressed in the context of the latter passage in the words, *μορφὴν δούλου λαβὼν* (ver. 7). When, hereunto, He took upon Him the *ὁμοίωμα ἀνθρώπου*, there was certainly involved the assumption of a *ψυχὴ*; for only through it, could He be a *δούλος*,

—not through the *σὰρξ* alone, and also not in His higher nature, to which the position of *δοῦλος* is altogether alien. Besides all this, the hypothesis of His complete humanity is also involved in the way in which the apostle so emphatically sets forth the sinlessness of Jesus.

We may now adduce as an element in Paul's teaching, that in the manifested Christ there was a pre-existing divine principle, and, indeed, a personal principle which in the fulness of time entered into humanity, and in this way assumed the *ὁμοίωμα σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας* (Rom. viii. 3), and thus became like to men, yet without sin. But being sent by God in this "likeness," His *σὰρξ* was a mortal but not a sinful *σάρξ*; yet because it was mortal, it was subject to the likes and dislikes of a mortal corporeality, and so far led to a capability of temptation in Christ. But in virtue of the fulness of divine life which was in Him, He subdued the whole development of any temptation to sin, and by the special spiritual power of life in Him glorified this *σὰρξ*, although it was the *ὁμοίωμα σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας*.

Our consideration of the Pauline conception of the human side in Jesus has shown us that the apostle ascribes to Him, even as man, a distinguished position as regards the rest of humanity: cf. Eph. i. 20–23, where He appears as one who appeared humanly, but through death was exalted over all. We now have to consider those passages in which the apostle dwells plainly on the supernatural side in the person of Christ. Among these are the Christological passages, Col. i. 15–20 and Phil. ii. 6–11. Here the higher element takes the lead, and the lower follows. Because this is so decidedly the case in the later epistles only, an inference has been drawn that the different passages were based on a different idea of the person of Christ. Some look upon this as only a development of Paul's doctrine; but others have considered the two elements as irreconcilable, and that the lower idea belongs to the earlier, and the higher idea to the later epistles; that Paul's idea of Christ appears to be of the one man in whom the Spirit of God pre-eminently worked, and that this idea became elevated at a subsequent period to that of divine greatness; that the idea of the pre-existence was not a Pauline one, and that the later epistles in which this idea is set forth are therefore non-Pauline.

But these opinions as to the Christology of the older epistles are not justified by the results of exact investigation. On the

contrary, the earlier will be found to contain the same exalted idea of Christ as the later epistles, although this idea is only intimated in isolated passages, and not so purposely laid down. The passage Rom. i. 3 f. has been much appealed to in order to show that Paul looked upon Christ as a man endowed with the Spirit, and after His death divinely exalted; but no proof of this is afforded by the passage. Paul here distinguishes two sides in the person of Christ, by applying to the common subject *υἱὸς Θεοῦ*, a denomination peculiar to each of the two predicates, in respect to which name the predicate is suitable. As certainly, therefore, as the *σὰρξ* was not something merely working in Christ, but was a constituting element of His person in His earthly life, so was the *πνεῦμα* something which formed an element of His person. The *πνεῦμα ἁγιοσύνης* is also something different from what is elsewhere called *πνεῦμα ἁγίου*; and this particular term is purposely selected here. It must not be explained as merely the principle of life in its widest acceptance; but the *πνεῦμα*, which was an element in the person of Christ, is the *πνεῦμα* of *ἁγιοσύνη* as it occurs in the LXX.—divine sublimity, the attribute of the *שׁוֹרֵק* (cf. the author's *Tübinger Weihnachtsprogramm* for 1834). It must not be said that Christ is attested as the Son of God by the *πνεῦμα ἁγιοσύνης*, but that Christ, inasmuch as He is the *πνεῦμα ἁγιοσύνης*, has been shown to be the Son of God by the resurrection. Thus Christ is, on the one hand, *σὰρξ*; and, on the other, an exalted divine Spirit. It is an important point that the Christology of the older epistles confirm our interpretation, as they nowhere state that the *πνεῦμα* was operative in Christ, but that Christ Himself was the life-giving Spirit (1 Cor. xv. 45),—indeed, that He is *τὸ πνεῦμα* (2 Cor. iii. 17 f.). Therefore it is most decidedly the doctrinal form of the two Epistles to the Corinthians, that Christ is the Lord = the Spirit, or the life-giving Spirit. Thus Paul calls the Spirit dwelling in believers the *πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ*, so that Christ Himself dwells in them (Rom. viii. 9; Eph. iii. 17; Gal. ii. 29). By interpreting Rom. i. 3 f. in the above-named sense, we are consequently quite in harmony with the older epistles generally. We are thus led back to the definitions of the older epistles which we before mentioned: Christ is the *Κύριος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ* (1 Cor. xv. 45), the Lord of glory, the image of God, *εἰκὼν Θεοῦ* (2 Cor. iv. 4). In addition, Christ, as pre-existent, was efficacious long before His

human appearance, namely, in the journey of the Israelites through the wilderness (1 Cor. x. 4). He is, indeed, the one *Κύριος δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα* (1 Cor. viii. 6). He is the pre-existing One who appeared upon earth, having been sent by God (Rom. viii. 3; Gal. iv. 4). The "sending" seems to point to the lower idea of Christ, but we must take into account the addition, that He came "in the likeness of sinful flesh." The apostle, then, does not look upon Him as originally and essentially man; but that His human appearance was something of a secondary nature, the *σὰρξ* being an addition to that which Christ was before. Not only is Jesus shown to be a pre-existing principle by the thus modified idea of His being sent, but He is expressly declared to be so in 1 Cor. viii. 6, where it is said that by Him all things exist. He is the image of God, and is the Spirit, the divine life (certainly as an exact image); He is also the principle which makes alive, from whom all life goes forth to the world, that is, by His agency. The nature which is here ascribed to Christ is exactly that which He must possess in order to be a Redeemer, so that all life, all sanctification, and all making free, proceed from Him.

In turning to the Christology of the later epistles, we find that the Epistle to the Ephesians sets forth, in the first place, only the resurrection and ascension which followed the death of Christ, and surveys His nature and dignity from the lower side as developed in His history (Eph. i. 20–23); but the epistle also contains a passage, ch. iv. 8–11, according to which this exaltation of Christ after His death was preceded by a lowering, a descending down to earth, which must be based on an original condition of exaltation. Paul, in quoting in ver. 8, Ps. lxviii. 18, shows that if, in the Old Testament, it was a result of the exaltation of God that men should offer to Him gifts of homage (Ps. lxviii. 18; Isa. lx. 7), the same results follow the ascension of Christ (1 Pet. ii. 5; Rom. xii. 1). But these gifts of homage presuppose God's gifts of grace to men, and Paul makes the participation of them dependent on the ascension of Jesus; so also Jesus Himself (John xvi. 7, cf. vii. 37), and Peter (Acts ii. 33, cf. 32). Through this exaltation Jesus became the head of the Church (Eph. i. 22, 23); but this exaltation presupposes a humiliation, which again points back to a previous condition of sublimity.

This mode of viewing the subject is very prominently brought for-

ward in the Epistles to the Philippians and Colossians. In Phil. ii. 6–11, the apostle, in his exhortation to humble self-denial and self-renunciation, reverts to Christ as a model. He starts from Christ's original likeness to God, and the position and circumstances corresponding to this likeness, and then speaks of His appearance on earth as a self-renunciation, and also of His self-humiliation to death, even the death of the cross, which was followed by His exaltation. It is at all events certain that the superhuman dignity, *εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ*, which Paul ascribes to Christ after His death, is not something absolutely new, but that He previously was *ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ*. Here, therefore, we have the same view which we find amply set forth in the older epistles, and especially also in the Epistle to the Ephesians,—that there was an original exaltedness, from which Christ lowered Himself to His earthly existence. The view taken of His higher nature and its pre-existence is still more fully developed in Col. i. 13–20 (cf. ii. 9, iii. 1–4). In Col. i. 13 the apostle commences with the idea of Christ as the Son of God's love, and then goes on to describe His person more closely. As regards God, He is *εἰκὼν*, i.e. He in whom the glory of God is reflected (cf. 2 Cor. iv. 4; Heb. i. 3; John xiv. 9), who, on the one hand, has in Himself the likeness to God (Phil. ii. 6), and, on the other, reveals to the world the invisible God. Both these ideas are involved in the term "image." He is also the *πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως*, who is the chief heir in whom full power dwells, so that everything is by Him,—a figure which is borrowed from the civil view of the first-born among the Hebrews as the lord over his brethren, and is applied to the relation of Jesus to believers first, and then to the whole of creation. All was created through Him, and the higher spirits are especially mentioned under the terms *θρόνοι*, etc. From the consideration of His relation as *κεφαλὴ* to the Church, the apostle reverts to a collective view of His person. At the conclusion of ver. 18 he comprises all together, and grounds this inclusion on the *ὅτι* in ver. 19, thus glancing at the divine counsel which is set forth in ver. 19 in reference to Jesus' person, and in ver. 20 in reference to His work, that all fulness dwells in Him, and that all things should be reconciled through Him. According to this, Christ is in an absolute sense the exact image of the invisible God, so that, indeed, this predicate peculiarly applies to Him; and He, as regards *πάντα*

κτίσις, is not the first among His like, but is the “first-born of every creature,” in the sense that all was created by Him,—that all things both in heaven and earth were created both by and for Him, and that by Him all things consist.

The cause which induced the apostle to set forth this universal position of Christ and His pre-existent nature was the prevalence of the theosophical Judaistic error, which ascribed to the higher world of spirits a position which was due only to Christ, viz. that the fellowship of man with God was brought about by them (Col. ii. 18, 19, cf. x. 15). In the older epistles, the apostle dealt with anthropological questions, and was therefore only indirectly led to speak of the Christology; but now the opposition to false doctrines induced him to enter upon the exaltedness of the person of Jesus, and to dwell thereon. Thus an advance in the Christology is by no means a sign of non-Pauline matter: it is only the detailed setting forth of the teaching which we find laid down essentially in the germ in 1 Cor. viii. 6, 2 Cor. iv. 4. One and the same fundamental view of this subject pervades all the epistles from the older to the later,—that *Christ is a pre-existing divine principle, who entered upon an earthly human life.*

But now the question arises: What is Paul's view of this higher principle in Christ as the pre-existing One? (1.) Is this pre-existing principle of a created nature, or not? Plainly not in Paul's view. If an attempt is made to show, from Col. i. 15, that the *πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως* is co-ordinate with the *κτίσις*, it must fail in reference to the context (vers. 16, 17), according to which all things were created through Him and for Him; and He is consequently removed out of the complex of all that is created. His existence, therefore, is not conditional on the existence of the world, as is that of every other creature on its creation; on the contrary, He is Himself the creative principle (δι' οὗ). Consequently, in the intention of the Epistle to the Colossians, this pre-existing principle cannot itself have the nature of a creature. This is still more clearly evident from Col. ii. 9: *θεότης* is here not God, but the Godhead, the divine nature; and *πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος* is everything that constitutes the being of God. But the word *σωματικῶς*, which cannot be merely = *actually*, points to something creature-like. This Christ is, however, the whole Christ, and not merely the pre-existing; and therefore everything by which the Godhead is complete dwells

in Christ not typically but *σωματικῶς*, so that this fulness itself is expressed in a human *σῶμα*. The higher element in the historical appearance of the Redeemer is consequently *πάν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος*, the divine nature or being. Combine with this what is said as to the operations of Christ (Col. ii. 10, iii. 4, 11, i. 20–22, 27), where He is represented as the universal head, and element of life, and we shall readily perceive that these are predicates which could not be asserted by Paul in the case of any created being. We must also compare Eph. i. 6, 7, 10, 23, iv. 10, where similar attributes are ascribed to Christ. From the Epistle to the Philippians we may no less decisively perceive that Christ cannot have been looked upon as of a creature-like nature: *εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ*, and religious adoration on all sides, even from the highest created beings, is ascribed to Him (Phil. ii. 6, 10, 11). If, moreover, we consider Paul's opposition to everything of a heathenish character, and his whole education in a strictly monotheistic school, it must appear a great contradiction if he looked upon Christ as a creature.

The older epistles, indeed, assert a dependence of Christ on God (1 Cor. iii. 23, xi. 3, xv. 24, 28), and this is involved in the idea of the relation of a son to a father; but, on the other hand, these epistles give Him attributes of such a nature that it would be impossible to assume that Paul considered Christ, in His pre-existent nature, to be a creature. Christ is in His nature "a quickening Spirit" (1 Cor. xv. 45); He is indeed *the Spirit* (2 Cor. iii. 17); He dwells in believers as the quickening and sanctifying Spirit (Rom. viii. 9–11); He is the Judge who revealeth even the counsel of the heart (1 Cor. iv. 4 f.; Rom. ii. 16, xiv. 11; 2 Thess. i. 7–10). He it is through whom, not only all redemption, but all existence, which has its first origin in God, is brought about (1 Cor. viii. 6). He is the Lord of living and dead, to whom Christians belong both in life and death, and whom they serve. He is indeed so far the principle of their life, that they themselves no longer live, but Christ in them (Rom. xiv. 7–9, 18; Gal. ii. 20). Paul desires grace and peace for his readers, not only from God the Father, but also from the Lord Jesus Christ (Rom. i. 7); thanks to God are given through the agency of Christ (Rom. i. 8; Col. iii. 17); and it is the aim of life in believers that the name of Christ should be glorified in them (2 Thess. ii. 14; Phil. i. 20). Christ is indeed so much the

object of religious invocation, that it is essential to the idea of a Christian that he should call upon the name of Jesus Christ (1 Cor. i. 2; Rom. x. 12); and Paul himself prays to Christ (2 Cor. xii. 8). Indeed, the very term *Kύριος*, so constantly used as the characteristic designation of Jesus Christ, is here of great importance; for in heathen usage "lord and king" was the designation of the highest God, and in the Old Testament יהוה is translated by *Kύριος*. If we put all these things together, it is very plain that we may not assume that Paul looked upon Christ in His pre-existing nature as a created being. When he places Christ in juxtaposition with God the Father, when, in 2 Cor. xiii. 14, he speaks of the threefold causality of salvation, he in fact sets Christ above the whole complex of the world, and thus above humanity. It would seem that the Pauline epistles go even further than this, and that they expressly designate Christ as Θεός. We are thus led to another question, *Whether, in Paul's view, Christ in His higher nature is directly God?*

Some of the passages in which Christ appears to be called God plainly bear this meaning only in appearance, such as Tit. i. 3, ii. 10, iii. 4, for it is evident that the Father is here described as σωτήρ; and some are not stringently demonstrative. With regard to the latter, in the passage Tit. ii. 13 the reference to Christ would be probable, grammatically speaking; for the article is only placed once, and consequently in classical usage the two ideas would be combined. It must, however, be allowed as possible that the article not having been placed a second time may be an inaccuracy. In the passage 1 Tim. iii. 16 the reading Θεός is a doubtful one. In our opinion ὅς is the more probable reading, by which it appears clearly that the Redeemer was a higher pre-existing being, who was made manifest in the σάρξ. The most important passage is Rom. ix. 5, when the connection and the philological points are entirely favourable to the reference of Θεός to Christ. In the first part of the verse Christ's human side is spoken of, and it would seem quite proper that His higher nature should follow on to it. The other interpretation which refers Θεός to God the Father leads to a philological difficulty. If by εὐλογητὸς a doxology be intended, and if the verb ἐστὶν or εἶη is understood, this *adjectivum verbale* should, as a rule, precede the subject (2 Cor. i. 3): it follows, however, when the verb is actually expressed (Rom. i. 25). The point is not whether, in

short propositions generally, and in doxologies especially, the subject can precede, but whether εὐλογητὸς can come after when the verb is not expressed. The usage as to this point is constant throughout the whole Greek literature; and if Ps. lviii. 19 be considered as an exception, it must be confessed that, even setting aside the fact that the first part of this passage is not to be interpreted as a doxology, and that, owing to the repetition of the word, the passage is altogether a peculiar one, an exception of this kind (opposed to the constant usage elsewhere) is not adapted to serve as any certain rule for the interpretation of another passage. If, therefore, Paul elsewhere applies the name Θεὸς to Christ, as is done by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews in ch. i. 8, 9, no exact philological exegesis would prevent our passage being explained in the same way. But we must still allow the possibility that even in the passage in question the peculiar turn of the construction of the passage may have led to an exception. The greater difficulty is, however, that Paul does not elsewhere unequivocally make use of the word Θεὸς as a predicate of Christ, and our passage therefore stands alone.

But, notwithstanding this, the idea of the *pre-existing Son* is firmly established as of an *essentially divine* (although only in the divine image) and *personal principle*.

The same points which prevent us from looking upon this principle as creature-like, also compel us to assume that the apostle considered it a *truly divine principle* which brings about the original being and continuous existence of everything springing from God (Col. i. 16; 1 Cor. viii. 6), so that created beings attain their aim and end only in Him and through Him (Col. i. 16). This principle also, as the Lord from heaven, is the quickening Spirit and the Spirit merely (1 Cor. xv. 45 ff.; 2 Cor. iii. 17 f.); so that, after the atonement for sinners had been brought about by the incarnation, their new life in the power of the divine Spirit, and also their future bodily glorification and the freeing and glorification of the whole of nature, are all brought about by Him. In this sense is Christ the one Lord (1 Cor. viii. 6), being originally in the form of God (Phil. ii. 6), in whom all the fulness of the Godhead dwells bodily (Col. ii. 9, cf. i. 19), the image of the invisible God (Col. i. 15; cf. 2 Cor. iv. 4).

But this pre-existing principle is *truly divine only*, as it were, *as an image*, and consequently in a *reflected* and *communicated*, and not in an originally independent way. This is involved in the expressions *εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ* and also *υἱὸς Θεοῦ* (*ἱδὶος υἱός*, Rom. viii. 32), and *πρωτότοκος*. His life is not, therefore, simply and originally independent, but it is so imparted that it is concentrated in Him into an independent focus of life, and from Him spread over all creation (Col. i. 16). His position is so eminently exalted above all creation, that He it is *δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα*, not *ἐξ οὗ*; He is always the Lord, He who is operative, but operative by intervention. His incarnation, therefore, is referred back to the Father, as a sending by the Father (Rom. viii. 3; Gal. iv. 4). His dominion is made over to Him by the Father; and when all enemies are overcome, He will hand it to the Father, all the intervening agency of the Son having then attained its aim (1 Cor. xv. 24–28). This idea of a principle pre-existing, truly divine and not creature-like, but reflected, is so completely Paul's idea, that by it all his utterances find their most satisfactory explanation. The entire Pauline Christology is nothing but the consistent development of this idea.

But *this pre-existent principle is in itself a personal one*, and is from the beginning the spirit and *εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ* (wherein the personality is essentially included), so that the creation of the world, as a divine act, is not merely the idea of the *εἶναι* or *κτισθῆναι ἐκ Θεοῦ*, but the *ἐν αὐτῷ* (*sc. υἱῷ*) or *δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν* is added. The incarnation is indeed an act of self-renunciation (Phil. ii. 7); and the position of man is *μορφὴ δούλου* in distinction from the *μορφὴ Θεοῦ*. This *μορφὴ Θεοῦ* is the divine shape: it is not in itself the *εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ*, but the mode in which this *εἶναι* is outwardly set forth. But *ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχων*, He thought not the *εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ* to be *ἀρπαγμός*, *i.e.* something which only for itself He arbitrarily desired to retain; but He lowered Himself,—that is, He so far gave up the *μορφὴ Θεοῦ* in assuming the *μορφὴ δουλοῦ*, and now, as regards God, He appeared as His *δούλος*, and, as regards men, as a *σύνδουλος*, *ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος* (cf. Rom. viii. 3). In His whole *habitus* He was found as a man, and humbled Himself by condescending to a voluntarily undertaken death, indeed to the death of a malefactor. The incarnation took place by means of an act of free self-renunciation, which is acknowledged in the highest

degree by the Father (Phil. ii. 9). From all this it is clearly evident that the pre-existing principle in Christ is looked upon as a personal one.

If we glance back at the purport of the Pauline Christology as it has been hitherto developed, we must perceive that there is, in fact, no cause for surprise at Paul naming Christ directly as God. His idea would not thus be altered; and this interpretation of Rom. ix. 5 remains, therefore, quite open to us. Adding to this the fact that the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews gives the predicate Θεός to Christ, and elsewhere expresses the same idea (Heb. i. 3, 8, 9), we find ourselves only a step from John's idea, which represents πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος by the expression λόγος, in whom he places the creative principle, giving Him the predicate of Θεός.

From our previous consideration, we see that there are *manifold conditions of the person of Christ*: (1.) The pre-human condition (1 Cor. x. 4; Col. i. 17; Phil. ii. 6); (2.) His earthly, human condition (Phil. ii. 7 f.), in which He was born (Gal. iv. 4; Rom. i. 3), lived as a man (Phil. ii. 7 f.), was crucified (1 Cor. i. 22), and died (1 Cor. xv. 3 f.; Rom. vi. 3-6); (3.) His glorified condition (Phil. ii. 9-11; Eph. i. 20-22, iv. 8, 18), to which belong the resurrection (1 Cor. xv. 20, 23; Rom. i. 4; Eph. i. 20), the sitting on the right hand of God, and the participation in the divine government of the world and the Church (Eph. i. 20-23; Col. iii. 1-3); also the future manifestation of Christ (1 Cor. i. 7; Col. iii. 4; Phil. iii. 20; 1 Thess. iv. 16; 2 Thess. i. 7, ii. 8).

§ 80. *Jesus Christ the Redeemer—His Work.*

Paul, just as Peter, usually presents us with the chief points of his teaching as to the *person of Christ* in those connections where he is led to speak of *Christ's work*. Both questions are so closely and inwardly connected, that they regulate one another; but, at the same time, it is not necessary that they should in every case have a similar importance in the grade of their development, and one can be more developed than the other. The work of Christ is more dwelt upon by Peter, in consequence of his copious explanation of the doctrine of atonement. With regard, however, to Paul, the necessity which was laid upon him, by his circumstances and position, of establishing the specific peculiarity of the New Testament work of salvation, led to a

more extensive development of teaching as to the person of Christ.

The aim of Christ's earthly appearance is redemption, *σῶσαι* (1 Tim. i. 15; cf. Tit. iii. 5); *σωτηρία* (1 Thess. v. 9); *ἀπολύτρωσις* (Rom. iii. 24; cf. 1 Cor. i. 30; Rom. viii. 23; Eph. i. 14, iv. 30; Col. i. 14; Eph. i. 7). The *groundwork of redemption* is the *atonement* for men by the *death of Jesus Christ*. This groundwork is, in Paul's view, *not the ministry of Christ*, however highly he may think of His word (Rom. x. 14–18), especially as the “word of reconciliation” (2 Cor. v. 18), and as the “preaching of the cross” (1 Cor. i. 18). Paul nowhere dwells upon the ministry of Christ, and, properly speaking, never mentions it. The passage Eph. ii. 17 is the nearest approach to it, but even here *ἐλθὼν* refers to the risen Christ. Paul himself, indeed, first became possessed of faith and the illumination of his mind through the risen Christ; and the whole of the Christian wisdom which Paul imparts (1 Cor. ii. 6–16) depends upon its being communicated through the Holy Spirit. He attaches great importance to the gospel as the message of salvation; but the groundwork of salvation is, in his view, the atonement, which is announced by the gospel, the ambassadors of which the apostle and his successors were (2 Cor. v. 20). Even the communication of the Spirit, however essential it may seem to him, does not form the groundwork of redemption (Rom. v. 5, viii. 9, 15, 16; Gal. iii. 5, iv. 6; Eph. i. 13 f., iv. 30); for Paul looks upon this communication as nothing but a result of the atonement, and the effects of Christ's exaltation (Eph. iv. 8). The groundwork of the whole work of redemption is the atonement through the death of Jesus Christ, as the act on which everything else depends. On this point Paul gives many *general expressions*; as, Christ died on account of our sins (Rom. iv. 25, cf. vi. 10, *τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ*, i.e. in consideration of sin; 1 Cor. xv. 3, *ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν*); also, *for our sakes* (*δι' ὧν*, 1 Cor. viii. 11); and more definitely, *for us* (*ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν*, 1 Thess. v. 10; Gal. ii. 20). In other passages the *ὑπὲρ* no longer means *for our advantage* only, but *in our stead*, He dying as a substitute for us (2 Cor. v. 14, 15, 21; Rom. v. 6–8), and giving Himself as a ransom for all (1 Tim. ii. 6).

The *death of Christ* is therefore, when more closely considered, *a vicarious*, and thus an *atoning death*.

That the death of Christ is looked upon as *vicarious*, is evident

generally from certain passages which leave no doubt on the point (2 Cor. v. 14, 21; Rom. v. 6-8). In the latter passage the death of Christ is compared with the death of men who are offered up to save others by their death. In 2 Cor. v., in ver. 20, *ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ* can only mean *in Christ's stead*;¹ and so in ver. 21 it is said of Christ that God made Him sin, *i.e.* treated Him as a sinner *in our stead*, that we in Christ might be righteous before God. This is rendered incontestable from vers. 14 and 15: "If one died for all, then all died," so far as the effects are concerned. This conclusion is impossible except under the idea of a vicarious substitution. The more exact signification of this vicarious death becomes simple and clear, if we keep close to the apostle's intention as represented in the ideas of *ἱλαστήριον* and *καταλλαγή*. They are both expressions which denote the atonement, but there is a distinction to be observed between them.

In the passage Rom. iii. 25, 26, the death of Christ is described as a death of *ἱλαστήριον*. The apostle has passed on from the negative portion of his statement as to *δικαιοσύνη*, to the positive proposition that men attain *δικαιοσύνη* through Christ (vers. 21, 22); and after again alluding to the universality of sinfulness (ver. 23), he shows that justification is the result of *ἀπολύτρωσις*. Two main propositions are to be distinguished here (vers. 25, 26): (1.) God has presented Christ as an *ἱλαστήριον* through His blood; (2.) God has done this in order to declare His righteousness, which, on account of the previous non-punishment of sins before committed, needed some special exhibition, as, looking at God's patience and long-suffering, His righteousness might seem to be slighted. Sin, therefore, has not been punished, but also not forgiven, so that an atonement might be accomplished. This is involved in the idea of *πάρεσις* (= *ὑπεριδεῖν*, Acts xvii. 30). There is thus required a display of His righteousness, for which the proper time appeared to have come. How this takes place is expressed in the sentence *ὃν προέθετο . . . αἵματι*. The words *ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι* are to be immediately referred to *ἱλαστήριον*. *Ἱλαστήριον* is used in the LXX. and Heb. ix. 5 as the term for the *lid of the ark*, over which God was supposed to be enthroned as the covenant-God, who dwells in the midst of His people; but, being offended by their sins, He can only dwell there so far as the pollution of His throne, caused by the sins of

¹ Also in Philom. 12, *ὑπὲρ σεῦ* can only mean "in thy stead."—(TR.)

the people, is expiated by the pure sacrificial blood. Here, however, the term *ἱλαστήριον* is applied to Christ; and as we do not find any such application elsewhere, probably we are not justified in applying it in this passage in the above-named sense. If adopted, we should have to imagine that Christ is the antitype of the mercy-seat or lid of the ark, inasmuch as in Him the Father dwells among men, and enthrones Himself among them as their reconciled Father. But this symbol is nowhere else applied to Christ, and it seems necessary that we should seek for some other meaning of the word *ἱλαστήριον*. It must be taken to denote that which is the means to *ἰλάσκεσθαι*. Thus it is explained in antiquity as a *propitiatory sacrifice*, just as *χαριστήριον*, a *thank-offering*; *σωτηρία*, a *peace-offering* (Ex. xx. 24). Indeed, in Eph. v. 2 Christ is described as *θυσία* (cf. 1 Cor. v. 7), and in John is expressly called *ἱλασμός* (1 John ii. 2). By the words *ἐν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ* we are reminded of the sacrificial blood shed for expiation; and thus it seems the more probable that *ἱλαστήριον* should be taken as a propitiatory sacrifice. Christ brings about the *ἰλάσκεσθαι τὸν Θεὸν τοῖς ἁμαρτωλοῖς*, so that, by the removal of the divine *ὀργή* (Rom. v. 9), which is the principle for the *δικαιοκρισία* (ii. 5), the subjects of which are sinners, the grace of God is applied to the latter. Christ is the propitiatory sacrifice which brings about this application of the divine grace by His blood, that is, by means of the shedding of His blood. The word *προέθετο* expresses a reference to the subject, which is more exactly defined in what follows: "to declare His righteousness." According to Paul, *it is God Himself who hath ordained this death of Christ* (cf. Rom. viii. 32, iv. 25; 2 Cor. v. 21), and hath set forth before all the world Christ by His blood as an *ἱλαστήριον*, inasmuch as all agency on the part of Christ, not only in the work of creation, but also in the work of redemption, absolutely originates in God Himself (2 Cor. v. 18 ff.; Rom. viii. 3). Thus *the death of Christ is the objective realization of the love of God towards sinners, who had hitherto been alienated from God* (Rom. v. 8, cf. vi. 7 and viii. 32). In Paul's view, therefore, the death of Christ is a manifestation and pledge of God's love, and consequently is a work of God's love.

Christ, however, inasmuch as He is *ἱλαστήριον*, accomplished something in His death which is the condition of our justification by means of faith in Him, and on which the ransoming in Christ

Jesus depends. This it is by which the setting forth of Christ as *ἱλαστήριον* by God becomes the *ἔνδειξις* of His *δικαιοσύνη*. This something is to some extent intimated in the word *ἱλαστήριον*, if we take it as meaning a propitiatory sacrifice; and we may conclude this from ver. 26, light being, indeed, clearly thrown upon it by other passages. The propitiatory sacrifice was, under the old covenant, the satisfaction ordained by God as the condition requisite for the re-attainment of His mercy, which the sinner who had incurred guilt before God had to make. Seeing that "the wages of sin is death" (Rom. vi. 23), Christ, in bringing about the re-attainment of God's grace, suffered death, in which He, in perfect obedience, by shedding of His blood offered up to God His sinless, holy life. Two points must be distinguished here: (1.) The propitiatory sacrifice is a gift well-pleasing to God, which He accepts, and on account of which He absolves the sinner from his guilt and punishment. The pure life offered up becomes a ransom for the guilt-burdened life of the sinner. Christ, His blood, and His death, became the *λύτρον*, the price, on account of which God would and could remit our sins. Thus the New Testament, both in the discourses of our Lord and also elsewhere, especially in Paul's teaching, in many places contains the proposition that Christ was the ransom for many for remission of their sins, or that He had given up His life as a ransom (Matt. xx. 28; cf. 1 Pet. i. 18, 19). *Ἀντίλυτρον* expresses still more strongly the vicarious idea (1 Tim. ii. 6); *λυτροῦσθαι* denotes ransoming (Tit. ii. 14; cf. 1 Pet. i. 18 f.); and thus *ἀπολύτρωσις* means a redemption by which we are freed from a liability under which we were towards God (Rom. iii. 24; Eph. i. 7). The ransoming of the sinner takes place partly by Christ Himself being the ransom, and partly by the subject of the *ἀπολύτρωσις* being himself in Christ by means of faith. It is also said that *we are bought* (1 Cor. vi. 20, vii. 23); that God hath purchased the Church by the blood of His Son (Acts xx. 28; cf. Rev. xiv. 3). Thus Christ has offered Himself to God as a gift and a sacrifice, *προφορὰν καὶ θυσίαν*, "for a sweet-smelling savour,"—i.e. as a gift well-pleasing to God (Eph. v. 2). (2.) But Christ as *ἱλαστήριον* has not only offered Himself up in perfect obedience as an acceptable gift to God, as a ransom which God accepts, and therefore releases the sinner, but we must also take into consideration that *Christ must suffer death*, in order to offer Himself up to God by

His blood as a sinless, holy gift. In the sacrificial victim, this death does not appear as penal. That which is offered up to God must be a gift, pure and well-pleasing to Him; but when the sacrificial idea is applied to Christ, we obtain a peculiar modification. Christ is given up to death; but certainly it is not the sinner who offers up Christ,—as, under the old covenant, the sinner had to bring a sacrifice for the satisfaction of his liability,—but God sets forth Jesus as *ἱλαστήριον* (Rom. iii. 25; 2 Cor. v. 21; Rom. viii. 3). God gives His Son up to death, and makes Him sin instead of all of us. Consequently God has done to His Son that which He must, in virtue of His *ὀργή*, have done to us sinners. The death which God decreed for mankind as the wages of sin, He decreed for His Son in man's stead. "God hath not spared His own Son" (Rom. viii. 32). The victims in the sacrifice of atonement were slain by the offerers, and the blood offered up by the priest: in the New Testament, it is, on the one hand, Christ Himself who offers Himself up, because it was His will, and, on the other, it is God who has set Him forth as *ἱλαστήριον*, and makes Him sin, that is, a substitute for sin (2 Cor. v. 21); it is God who hath in Christ condemned sin in the flesh (Rom. viii. 3), by giving Him up to death. Because Christ was sent in the likeness of sinful flesh and for the sake of sin, sin being condemned in Him, it is condemned in human flesh. The law was not able to effectually put away sin in our flesh, and to condemn it so effectively as to overcome it; but by the death of the Son, sin, even in our flesh, has become conquerable. This idea is based on the principle that *sin has been condemned and punished in Christ's flesh*; and that we may perceive this more clearly, and accept it without reluctance, we must bring forward one more passage, which represents the whole matter in the clearest way (Gal. iii. 13). All that the wrath of God had decreed for sinners—the curse, punishment, and death—hath been imposed by God on His Son, in order to redeem us from the curse of the law. Here we see clearly what the results are of the surrender of the sinless, holy Son of God. Certainly He is a gift well-pleasing to God, an offering acceptable to Him, a ransom which He receives in order that we may be redeemed from the curse to which we were liable; but the act of Christ's surrender can only become a gift well-pleasing to God by means of His death, by His bearing that which was laid upon sin, the curse imposed on the sinner.

Therefore Paul, Rom. viii. 3, speaks of *κατακρίνειν*. The righteousness, which is compromised and considered to be injured by the non-punishment of human sinning during the pre-Christian period, is now actually manifested by God setting forth His Son as *ἱλαστήριον* by His blood. A satisfaction is made, *not by the punishment of the sinner*, but by *the condemnation of sin* in Him who is the Mediator between God and man, *by giving Himself* as an *ἀντίλυτρον* for all (1 Tim. ii. 5 f.). And so far God's righteousness is effectively shown forth, just as in the old covenant God had ordained a way in the Levitical dispensation by means of a propitiatory sacrifice, for the people generally and for each one of its members to make atonement, and thus to satisfy the *δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ*,—this being done preliminarily by the acceptance of a suitable *λύτρον*, until the sufficient *ἀντίλυτρον* for the whole of mankind appeared, and God thus "might be just, and the justifier of him who believeth in Jesus" (Rom. iii. 26). This death of Christ as *ἱλαστήριον* is therefore *a suffering, which, however, is at the same time an action* (Rom. v. 18, 19; Phil. ii. 8; Eph. v. 2; 1 Tim. ii. 6; Tit. ii. 14). His death is therefore represented from two points of view: on the one hand, it is a suffering in which He bore the curse of sin (Gal. iii. 13; 2 Cor. v. 21; Rom. viii. 3); on the other hand, it is an action, a *δικαίωμα*, a *ὑπακοή*, indeed (Phil. ii. 8), the culminating point of the obedience of the Son of God which embraced the whole of His earthly life. In both respects His death is our ransom (cf. Rom. iii. 24; Eph. i. 7; Col. i. 14; Tit. ii. 14). This our ransom was made not only *through* Christ, but *in* Christ (Col. i. 14; Eph. i. 7), and, according to the latter passage, in *His blood*. The *ἀπολύτρωσις* is inseparable from His person, and we cannot have it without being in the inmost fellowship with Him in faith. This leads us to the second main point of view.

The death of Christ is a death for our *καταλλαγή*, for our reconciliation (2 Cor. v. 18-20; Rom. v. 10 f.; cf. Eph. ii. 16; Col. i. 21). We are reconciled to God through the death of Christ (Rom. v. 10); we have received the *καταλλαγήν* (ver. 11); God hath reconciled us to Himself by Jesus Christ (2 Cor. v. 18); He was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself (ver. 19). *Καταλλάσσειν* denotes an alteration in the relation of one person to another, by which one (1) ceases to be an object of hostility as regards the other (cf. 1 Sam. xxix. 4); (2) and also ceases to

be himself hostile to the other (1 Cor. vii. 11). We who stood in a relation of alienation from God have been placed in a position of harmony with Him, so that He has shown to us, who were His enemies, His love and mercy instead of His *ὀργή* (Rom. v. 10), and has removed the hostile feeling in us by inspiring us with a new confidence in His love and favour. We shall have childlike love and confidence in the place of alienating mistrust and fear of punishment or *ὀργή*, and also instead of the *ἔχθρα εἰς Θεόν*. The death of Christ tends to this *καταλλαγή*, inasmuch as He is the manifestation and pledge of the divine love; and God reckons not their trespasses to men (2 Cor. v. 19), but has made Him who knew no sin to be sin for us (ver. 21). Thus, in Rom. v., "God commendeth His love towards us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us" (ver. 8), and, while we were enemies, we were reconciled to God (ver. 10); not, indeed, by our own power, but all comes from God, who hath reconciled us to Himself through Christ. We thus receive the *καταλλαγή*: it is a gift, and although something which shows itself in the subject, yet it is through God's grace. This *καταλλαγή* presupposes the death of Christ as the *ἱλαστήριον*,—the former being the *subjective*, and the latter the *objective* point in Christ's death. Thus *καταλλαγήναι τῷ Θεῷ* is an effective entry into the new relation to God, objectively grounded on Christ's work of atonement. Christ is set forth as an *ἱλαστήριον* independently of our faith; but the reconciliation avails only to believers who are already *δικαιωθέντες* (Rom. v. 9). Yet the *ἱλαστήριον* aims at our receiving the *καταλλαγήν* by means of faith. Therefore God is in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, by not imputing their sins unto them (2 Cor. v. 19); but this only takes place where there is faith. The *καταλλαγή* is therefore the application of the objective event to the believing subject; it is objectively offered in the atonement and in the word. The establishment of these is, however, the essential consequence of the atoning death of Christ (ver. 18; cf. Luke xxiv. 46 f.). We are not yet reconciled so long as we do not allow ourselves to be reconciled: *καταλλαγή* only comes by means of faith.

It is thus laid down what we are to think about the controversy as to the objective or subjective character of the reconciliation,—that is, the question whether God is reconciled with us, or

we with Him. At all events, we are *ἐχθροί* (Rom. v. 10 ; Col. i. 21) and *ἀπηλλοτριωμένοι* (Col. i. 21 ; Eph. iv. 18) : we must make up our minds to reconciliation, and must be summoned to it (2 Cor. v. 20). But in the latter passage the passive expresses an act to be assumed, in which we are in the first place in a passive position. We are taken to be *ἐχθροί*, or rather as objects of the divine wrath ; and our ceasing to be so is involved in the *καταλλαγήναι*. It is God who tenders this reconciliation to us. Indeed, it is He who effects it, as proceeding from His love (Rom. v. 8 ff. ; Eph. ii. 16 ; 2 Cor. v. 18 ff. ; Col. i. 21 ff. ; Rom. viii. 3 ; Gal. iv. 4 ; Tit. ii. 11-15, cf. iii. 4-7). But this only sets aside the view that the reconciling impulse is outside God and His will, and by no means does away with the idea of an objective reconciliation, by which our position is altered as regards God. Therefore the effect of the death of Christ is, according to Paul, objective as well as subjective. But we must go still a step further. God has intended the death of Christ not only as a sign and pledge of His love, but also as a manifestation of His holiness and righteousness, and as a condition for the pardon of the sinner. How the facts can be coincident, that He is both the author of the reconciliation, and also the party reconciled, can only be included within this idea of the *καταλλαγή*, by proceeding on the elements which are afforded by Paul's teaching as to the death of Christ as the *ἱλαστήριον*.

This *atoning death of Christ* is essentially connected with the whole of His earthly life, so far as His death is represented as a moral act of obedience (Phil. ii. 8 ; Rom. v. 19), and is the death of the sinless and holy One (2 Cor. v. 21). It thus becomes the culminating point of the obedience and of the whole life of Christ. In order to die as the atoning sacrifice for us, it must be the very same Christ who was displayed to us in His human life.

The *atoning death of Jesus Christ* is also most closely united with His glorified life. His death and resurrection are so combined, that the resurrection becomes a condition for our justification (Rom. iv. 25 ; 2 Cor. v. 15) ; and if Christ were not risen, we should be still in our sins (1 Cor. xv. 17). Not until the resurrection did the death of Christ receive the divine testimony, that it was well-pleasing to God, and accepted as the atoning gift. The resurrection is also, as the entry of Christ into the divinely glorified life, the condition and principle of our faith,

without which no subjective share in the fruits of the atoning death would be possible. In consequence of His atoning death, Christ is risen, and is thus not only represented as the Son of God with power (Rom. i. 4), but also He lives $\tau\omega\ \Theta\epsilon\omega$, after He had died to sin, *i.e.* on account of sin, for the atonement for sins (Rom. vi. 10, cf. 9, 11). As risen (Rom. viii. 34), and sitting on the right hand of God, He lives by the power of God (2 Cor. xiii. 4). This is His $\zeta\omega\eta$ (Rom. v. 10); and, being exalted and living, He it is who makes intercession with the Father as our Advocate (Rom. viii. 34),—a doctrine which, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, is closely united with that of the atoning death. It is He also for whose sake God vouchsafes to men all salvation under the conditions laid down. But He lives as our life (Col. iii. 4), and therefore, on the one hand, lives *in* us (Gal. ii. 20), and we live *with* Him (Rom. vi. 8; 2 Cor. xiii. 4), and, on the other, He it is through whom everything which tends to salvation comes to us. He is the Lord, through whom God's grace reigns through righteousness unto eternal life (Rom. v. 21, 10). Grace is the principle of salvation only through Jesus Christ as our Lord, inasmuch as He is not only called Lord, but also $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\iota$ or $\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\iota$ over us; so that henceforth $\acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\rho\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha$ $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\iota$ no longer, but $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\varsigma$ exercises a salutary rule, leading to $\zeta\omega\eta\ \alpha\iota\omega\acute{\nu}\iota\omicron\varsigma$ (Rom. v. 21, vi. 15–23). But Christ is this all-powerful efficacious Κύριος only by transferring to a higher stage the mode and grace of manifestation which exists in the present $\alpha\iota\omega\acute{\nu}$. Christ, as our life, is now hidden in God (Col. iii. 3). The full power of His $\zeta\omega\eta$, as our principle of life, is indeed in God, but not yet evident in the world; but a time is coming when Christ will be manifest even in this respect (Col. iii. 4). Then, too, not only will Christ be first completely manifest as our Lord, but also divine grace, as the divine principle of salvation, will first completely show forth its rule.

But with Christ's atoning work and death is also connected *the communication of the Holy Spirit*. The apostles, indeed, teach generally, that to those Christians who, under the prescribed conditions, share in the atonement, the Holy Spirit should be given by God, and by the Spirit the love of God should be shed into their hearts (Rom. v. 5). This is the Spirit of life, the quickening Spirit of Christ (Rom. viii. 2), the $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\ \text{Χριστοῦ}$ or Θεοῦ which dwells in believers (vers. 9 ff., 15 f., 26 f.; 1 Cor. ii. 12).

It is God who has given us the Spirit (Rom. v. 5 ; Gal. iv. 6), or has given the Spirit in our hearts as an earnest of future perfection (2 Cor. i. 22, v. 5 ; Eph. i. 13 f.). He is therefore the Spirit of the living God (2 Cor. iii. 3). But, in addition to this teaching as to the communication of the Spirit being an act of God generally, there are other expressions of the apostle which consider it as the *act of Christ*. Not only do we have the Spirit of life in fellowship with Christ (Rom. viii. 2), but in Rom. viii. 9, 2 Cor. iii. 17, it is the Spirit of Christ ; so that, if we have this Spirit of God, Christ is in us as the constant principle of life. Thus it is only a step further, when we find that, in Eph. iv. 7-10, Christ the exalted One is represented as He who communicates the Spirit as well as all gifts. This Spirit is imparted to us through Christ, inasmuch as Christ Himself is the quickening principle. The apostle firmly holds that Christ became this in His heavenly exaltation following on His atoning death ; and likewise that man has the quickening principle only in Christ Jesus, and has the Spirit of God only as the Spirit of Christ, and that thus only Christ dwells in us (Rom. viii. 9 f.) ; and therefore that all the gifts of the Spirit are received only in connection with Christ. Thus Paul tells the Galatians, as a fundamental proposition, that they received the Spirit only by the preaching of faith (Gal. iii. 2, iv. 6). This, however, is *connected with the atoning death of Christ*,—objectively, because the exaltation of Jesus Christ, through which He became our life, came to pass only in consequence of His atoning death ; and next, subjectively, because this communication of the divine Spirit, as the Spirit of Sonship (Gal. iv. 6), can only be possessed by those who, under the prescribed conditions, are partakers in Christ's atonement, and consequently is brought about by faith in Christ (Gal. iii. 2, 5), not by the fulfilment of the law. From all this it is clear that, in Paul's view, the atoning death of Christ is the groundwork of the whole work of redemption, and is therefore set forth by him in a peculiar way.

The spiritual effects which, founded on the accomplishment of the atonement, flow from the exalted Christ, are followed by the future bodily glorification which is ascribed to Him (Phil. iii. 21), and is connected with the *future completion of redemption* generally. Christ is the first-fruits of the resurrection (1 Cor. xv. 20), and only in Him shall we all be made alive (ver. 22). In principle,

we are already transferred to life through Him (Eph. ii. 5 f.), and this life will one day be manifested in its full power.

In the two elements of Christ's work, in the atonement and in the communication of the Spirit, *the Old Testament dispensation has attained the end at which it aimed*, and therefore, being only a preparative dispensation, is put away. Paul was compelled to show this *ex professo* as regards the law. *Christ is the end of the law* (Rom. x. 4); and in this, two points are involved: (a) *The position of man, for which the law was prescribed, has come to an end with Christ.* This is the position which Paul, in the Epistle to the Galatians, compares to that of a child, who during his nonage, although the child of his father, is kept in bondage as a servant, and needs the constraint and guidance suitable to his immaturity. So long as the heir is a child, there is no difference between him and a δοῦλος (Gal. iv. 1), although he has the claim to be lord of all: he is under an ἐπίτροπος and οἰκονόμος until the time appointed by the father. The spiritual ἐπίτροποι and οἰκονόμοι are represented by the law and its commandments; and this position of immaturity is based upon the fleshliness of man, on the sinful propensity to which he is subject. So long as the dominion of the σαρκὶς endures, the νόμος has full power. But this νόμος to which man is subject cannot put away sin, but serves to bring actual sin arising from the σαρκὶς to full development (Rom. vii. 5, 7-25). Therefore ὑπὸ νόμον εἶναι and ὑφ' ἁμαρτίαν εἶναι are identical. Man must sin so long as he is ὑπὸ νόμον: ἁμαρτία is lord over us (Rom. vi. 14, iii. 9). But when man is placed in the contrasted position, neither the νόμος nor ἁμαρτία any longer reigns. This relation is typified by Paul by a legal example of the relation between a wife and her husband (Rom. vii. 1-3): only so long as the man lives is the woman bound to him, and after his death she can marry another. But by the death of Christ men have experienced death, and are now to be considered as dead to the law, which has no more power over them, they having become subjects of another. They are dead as regards their former spiritual position, and the law has no more claim on them, as they are set free from that to which they were formerly liable. Consequently the position of man for which the law was prescribed comes to an end: the σαρκὶς no longer rules in him, and the curse is no longer on him (Gal. iii. 13). (b) *A new and higher divine dispensation has presented*

itself,—Christ a new power over man. God has sent His Son to free us from the law, and has given us the spirit of His Son, whereby we cry, Abba, Father! (Gal. iv. 4 ff.), and are therefore in full possession of the sonship. By the advent of this higher dispensation the lower one lost its right over us. When the spirit has entered, the letter no longer has authority. Christ has died for us, in order henceforth, as the risen One, to be the Lord to whom we are to bring forth fruit; following out the figure of marriage, He has come instead of the law, and is our marriage-lord, to whom we men are to appertain in a fruitful fellowship (Rom. vii. 4–6). Christ has in His death annulled all claim of the law upon us, and has nailed the bill of accusation, with Himself, upon the cross (Col. ii. 14); and so far the law was only a prefiguration and a shadow of the future (ver. 17), and is vanished away; but in the place of the shadow the substance has presented itself in Christ. The “law of commandments,” as regards its external statutes, is abolished by the death of Christ; and thus the law, so far as it was a barrier between Jew and Gentile, is broken down; and similarly the inward enmity between them is done away with (Eph. ii. 14–16). In its place something higher has now come, which unites and reconciles, but no longer separates: in the body of Christ offered up for us we are reconciled with God, and in the Holy Spirit imparted to us we have access to the Father. Thus Christ has become personally our peace (ver. 14): the two parts are united by both being in like manner reconciled with God in Christ (ver. 16, cf. 19–22). Christ having appeared as the higher principle, the lower institution is abolished: through Him *men are raised to a higher position for which the law was no longer fitted*; and we are thus led to the subjective side of the *δικαιοσύνη* and *ζωή* brought about by Jesus Christ.

§ 81. *Righteousness and Life through Jesus.*

The state of salvation, with a distinct reference to Jesus as its agent, is styled *σωτηρία* (Rom. i. 16, x. 10, xi. 11; Phil. ii. 12; 2 Cor. vii. 10), the deliverance from the ruin based on sin, briefly redemption; therefore Christianity is pre-eminently called *εὐαγγέλιον τῆς σωτηρίας* (Eph. i. 13; cf. Acts xiii. 26, xvi. 17, 2 Tim. iii. 15; Phil. iii. 28). It is therefore the true salvation on which the destination of man depends, from which he is with-

drawn by sin, and to which he is led by the redeeming grace of God; it is therefore opposed to *ἀπώλεια* (Phil. i. 28; 1 Cor. i. 18). We find the same idea modified in the sense of a completion of salvation at a future period of the human existence (Rom. xiii. 11; Phil. i. 28; 2 Tim. ii. 10; cf. 1 Pet. i. 5, 9, 10). This state of salvation is now chiefly represented as *righteousness*, *δικαιοσύνη* (cf. § 73), which is given by Christ, the higher principle arising among mankind, and as the Lord from heaven, their head (cf. Eph. i. 22 f.; Col. i. 18). *Δικαιοσύνη* is partly the groundwork and partly the essence of salvation, and is therefore the idea more closely defining the nature of *σωτηρία* (Rom. i. 17, cf. 16; also the juxtaposition of the two ideas in Rom. x. 10). Salvation also appears as *life*, *ζωή* (Rom. v. 17, 18, cf. 21, vi. 13). In the Epistle to the Romans three sides of the question are displayed: first, the being justified (Rom. iii. 25—ch. v. fin.); next, the inner life of the justified by means of fellowship with Christ (Rom. vi., vii.), where the Lord is described as presented to us with power in the place of the *νόμος*; and, lastly, it is this righteousness which has in itself life, *ζωή*, as a beatifying life, as sonship to God, and its future inheritance (ch. viii.). The integral points of redemption are more copiously set forth by Paul in 1 Cor. i. 30. Wisdom, *σοφία*, is placed first, because it was important to inform the Corinthian Church of the relation of the gospel to true wisdom. Next follow justification and sanctification; and lastly redemption, *ἀπολύτρωσις*, in a narrower sense than the final and completing redemption of the world.

For the realization of this salvation there are *two conditions*: one, subjective on the part of man, is *faith*; and the other, objective, is the *divine grace* which calls man.

Faith, as the subjective appropriation of redemption, we have already met with in James and Peter. But a more sharply defined and more profound idea of it is set forth by Paul. In his view, it is the confident grasping and holding fast of Jesus Christ which presupposes a renunciation of one's own sufficiency, and is an entry into the fellowship with Christ. Thus, in the Epistle to the Romans, he has contrasted it with the works of the law (ch. iii. iv. v.), also in the Epistle to the Galatians (ch. ii. iii.), and elsewhere. Faith, first of all, generally refers to Christ or to the gospel (Rom. i. 16, 17); it is the subjective origin of the *δικαιοσύνη*, and is continuously that to which the

latter refers (cf. Rom. iii. 22). The Pauline faith is not a mere honesty of conviction, *i.e.* a willing and doing which is in constant harmony with the conviction of any one: *πίστις* has, indeed, in some places the signification of faithfulness (Rom. iii. 3; 1 Tim. i. 19), but in most passages this idea is not contained in it, but only that of confident conviction and trust. The idea of moral conviction is involved in only one passage (Rom. xiv. 22, 23. In Rom. iii. 22 *Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* is not the subject, but the object of the faith, as in Gal. ii. 16, 20). Also it is not merely a theoretical and sure belief in the gospel, or a knowledge of Christ, but a lively inward apprehension of them; so that one's spiritual and moral personality takes Christ as its central aim, and is based on Him alone (hence *πιστεύειν εἰς*, Rom. x. 14; Gal. ii. 16; Phil. i. 29; and *ἐπί*, Rom. iv. 5, 24; and *πίστις ἐν Χριστῷ*, Gal. iii. 26, and elsewhere). But the divine grace is grasped and held in Christ; therefore, in addition to the entry into fellowship with Christ, faith also involves the renunciation of one's own personal sufficiency, and therefore refers specially to Christ's atoning death, the *ἱλαστήριον* (Rom. iii. 25). Thus, then, it forms the most decided contrast to the righteousness through the *ἔργα νόμου*, being the living source of love, the *πίστις δι' ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη* (Gal. v. 6; cf. Eph. ii. 10).

But the faith which apprehends Christ does not on this account show any outflow of salvation from man; it is rather an apprehension of that by which man is first apprehended (Phil. iii. 12), of that which makes its abode in the heart itself (Eph. iii. 17). We are thus led back to the requirement of the free divine *calling*, the *καλεῖν* (1 Cor. i. 9; Rom. ix. 24; 2 Thess. ii. 14; 1 Thess. iv. 7; cf. the designation of Christians as *κλητοὶ* at the commencement of the epistle). The calling which leads to faith is the result of an eternal, eclectic counsel of God, *ἡ κατ' ἐκλογὴν πρόθεσις* (Rom. ix. 11). Thus men of all kinds, even in a moral point of view, are called; and the calling is therefore purely a matter of divine pity. This Paul most surprisingly experienced in his own person (1 Tim. i. 16, cf. 15). This choice is the *αἰρεῖσθαι* (2 Thess. ii. 13), the result of which is the *καλεῖν*. The apostle has expressed the same idea in the word *ἐξελέξατο* (Eph. i. 4), and in *προγινώσκειν*, to foreknow (Rom. viii. 29; cf. 1 Pet. i. 20); likewise in *προορίζειν*, to predestinate (Rom. viii. 29, 30; Eph. i. 11, 5), and in *προετοιμάζειν*

(Rom. ix. 23). In all this the will of God is entirely free (Rom. xi. 7), a pure *ἐκλογή*, which, according to Eph. i. 4, 5, from the very beginning referred to Christ or to the sanctification by the Holy Spirit, by faith in the truth of the gospel (Rom. viii. 29, 30). Thus in Eph. i. 4 the apostle expresses himself in these words: *καθὼς ἐξελέξατο ἡμᾶς ἐν αὐτῷ πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου*. The possession of Christian salvation depends on a counsel of choice, which is represented as an eternal act of God, as brought about through Christ, having as its aim to sanctify us and make us blameless children of God, and also as tending to glorify the divine grace. And that these individuals among so many millions have attained the salvation of redemption, is plainly referred to a positive causality on God's part, to an eternal act of His will. The apostle has, however, most copiously expressed himself on this point in Rom. ix., cf. xi. 5, 7. He refers back justification to the divine nature and to the principles of the divine counsel expressed in the Old Testament, and discusses the question why the ancient people of God now for the most part took no share in the blessings of the gospel. Here two points had to be shown: first, that the privilege of the theocracy depended simply on God's unconditional grace; and, secondly, that it was the fault of the Israelites when they forfeited it. The result of this twofold consideration is, that Paul's teaching and view of the gospel do not controvert the ancient promise,—a glance at a positive future fulfilment being added. Thus the apostle shows that the first choice of Abraham and Isaac was absolutely free, and applied to the children of the promise alone (cf. Rom. iv. and Gal. iii. 6), and that consequently the theocratic promise was independent of any claim of race or merit, and was a matter of God's free grace, in virtue of which He conferred it on whom He would, *i.e.* to the true Israel (ver. 6). Thus the Messianic blessings are conferred only on those to whom He willed to give them, to the true Israel, which in faith is like Abraham. For it depends entirely upon His free will as to whom He will have mercy upon (ver. 15), *i.e.* under what conditions He will grant His grace (ver. 14). The unconditional nature of His will is also proved in those who oppose Him, and become the objects of His judgment (vers. 17, 18). But, as regards this absolute will of God, we are not to understand that some men are unconditionally destined to evil and others to good.

This objection is made by the apostle, as if from the lips of a stiff-necked Jew (ver. 19). It is repelled, first, with a view to the mind which inspired it, by opposing to the refractoriness involved therein the creative power of God and the absolute dependence of the creature on his Creator (vers. 20, 21); next, by looking at the matter from an opposite point of view, *i.e.* by showing that in all these cases God acts according to His essential attributes. The main point is, that the whole of God's procedure which is impeached is regarded by the apostle rather in the light of long-sufferance. This, indeed, so much preponderates, that the manifestation of wrath and power is concealed by it. Indeed, even with the purpose of the latter an intention of mercy is always entwined (ver. 23), so that everywhere this twofold purpose may be recognised. But the course of his remarks now leads him back to his more immediate theme, so that he can apply to the present case the idea of the freedom of the divine choice of grace independent of any claim of right, and can support, by Old Testament passages, the divine prevision of the dispensation, that Jews and Gentiles were called to be partakers in Christ's salvation, and that a portion of the Jews were excluded therefrom.

Those who are thus *chosen* must also necessarily be *called* (2 Thess. ii. 14, 15); and after the calling has reached them by the preaching of the gospel, and by their accepting it, they thus become partakers in the Spirit. But the calling itself is by no means merely an external act, but takes place principally through the effects of the word upon men. By it the divine will is brought near to man, in order to procure for him complete salvation; but it is dependent on his yielding to it by faith. Those who are called can, however, oppose (Rom. x. 19-21), as is shown by the resistance of the Jews (Rom. x. 3, ix. 30-33). There are therefore "vessels of wrath" (Rom. ix. 22), who are not, however, originally excluded from the divine goodness, but become so through their opposition whilst opportunity was afforded for their acceptance; and therefore, after having to the very last despised and rejected God's goodness, they incur the divine *ὀργή*, which, following a psychological law founded in the moral order of the world, completes their hardening. This reference of grace to an absolute counsel of God does not warrant any assumption of a purpose of destruction. This we may infer, both from the fact that it is this very idea which the apostle (Rom. ix. 19)

opposes as an objection which might be made to him, and also from his connecting the idea of hardening (ver. 22) with that of long-suffering, thus clearly pointing to a free will on man's part, to which a certain respite is given (cf. ver. 32). We have here the same idea of the consummation of sin through God's judgment as is expressed in Rom. i. 24, 26, 28 (cf. ver. 18–20, 21 ff., 25, 32, ii. 1, xi. 7, 8, 10; cf. vers. 20 and 10 with 16–21 and 2 Thess. ii. 11; cf. also John xii. 40, 37–39, 47–49; Matt. xiii. 13–16). In a dogmatical point of view, Paul supplies no higher scheme of union of the definitions of the universal divine counsel of grace here placed in juxtaposition,—of human free will and the divine purpose, which makes certain men to be *σκεύη ὀργῆς*,—all he does is to bring together and set forth these facts. But this much is certain, that Paul does not speak of any particular counsel which from the very first rejects men. For, apart from the points just mentioned, nothing can be more forcible than the way in which he sets forth that, as the Scriptures have concluded all under sin, *i.e.* specified all men as sinners, so, on the other hand, God's mercy extends to all (Rom. xi. 32, v. 18).

We now have to consider Paul's teaching as to the appropriation and realization of this salvation, in respect both to *individuals* and also to the *Church*: in the first place, in individuals, as *justification* and a *new life*, and next, as *salvation* in the latter.

§ 82. *The Salvation of Individuals—Justification.*

The first point in subjective redemption is, according to Paul, *justification*, ἡ δικαίωσις ἡμῶν (Rom. iv. 25, cf. v. 18, iii. 30): δικαιοῦν, God justifying believers (Rom. iii. 26, viii. 30, 33); δικαιοῦσθαι, the believer being justified (Rom. iii. 24, 28, v. 1; Gal. ii. 16, 17; Tit. iii. 7); and also the δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ, as a gift received from God (Rom. v. 17; cf. x. 3, 4, ix. 30).

The question now is as to the signification of this term. The idea of δικαιοσύνη itself has been previously discussed; all we have now to do with is how to understand the term δικαιοῦν.

Δικαιοῦν generally means to make right, to acknowledge, treat, declare as right or just. In classical usage the word has two main significations: (1) *to do that which is right*, in the sense of awarding to any one his right: δικαιοῦν τινα, as a contrast to ἀδικεῖν τινα; as κακοῦν τινα is to inflict κακόν, evil, on any one, so δικαιοῦν is to do δίκαιον, that which is just; hence then δικαι-

οὐσθαι, to maintain his right, in contrast to ἀδικεῖσθαι. Cf. Aristot. *Eth. Nicom.* v. 9, 11. As it is generally said of a judge who pronounces rightly, that he awards to any one his right, so, following the twofold result of a decision, it may have a twofold meaning, either of condemning and punishing, as often in the classics, or of doing justice in a favourable sense, viz. acquitting any one from an accusation, or acknowledging or awarding to him his just claim. (2) It also means to consider, declare, or approve of anything as right; just as ἀξιόδν.

In the Old Testament the word has the signification of *pronouncing sentence, of judging rightly* (by a judge); thus in the LXX. (for דִּינָה, 2 Sam. xv. 4; Ps. lxxxii. 3; Isa. i. 17); especially in a good sense, that justice is done to the good cause. Then it also means, *to make righteous or good*. Thus in a few Old Testament passages, as Ps. lxxiii. 13, ἐδικαίωσα τὴν καρδίαν μου. On the other hand, δικαιοῦν very frequently has the signification of *esteeming, acknowledging, treating, and declaring as righteous*. It is thus especially used for the judicial function of acquitting, of pronouncing innocent and exempt from punishment (Ex. xxiii. 7; Isa. v. 23; Deut. xxv. 1; 1 Kings viii. 32); also of God as Judge; hence οὐ δικαιοῦσθαι (Ecclus. xxiii. 11, cf. ix. 12), is *not to be exempt from punishment*. But it has this meaning in the sense of daily life also, and signifies first *to excuse, to vindicate*, sometimes by words (Ecclus. xiii. 22), sometimes by actions (Jer. iii. 11; Ezek. xvi. 51, 52). Δικαιοῦν in this sense corresponds to the other expression which is used in the LXX. for יָצַד יָצַד (Job xxxii. 2): ἀπέφηνεν ἑαυτὸν δίκαιον, etc. (cf. ver. 1, "He was righteous in his own eyes"). With this wider acceptance is connected the signification, *to acknowledge as righteous*, especially in the passive, *to be acknowledged as righteous* (Ecclus. xviii. 2; Job xxxiii. 2); and also to represent as righteous, and actually to prove it (Ecclus. xxxiv. 5).

The usage in the New Testament follows altogether the second of the two chief classical significations. We find δικαιοῦν used with *God* as the object who is acknowledged as righteous (Rom. iii. 4 (from Ps. li. 6); Luke vii. 29: ἐδικαίωσαν τὸν Θεὸν βαπτισθέντες; ver. 35: ἐδικαιώθη ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ τῶν τέκνων, etc.; cf. Matt. xi. 19). It is also used of Christ, who is justified by the Spirit (1 Tim. iii. 16). In these two cases the object is inherently righteous, and it is merely said that He is acknow-

ledged as righteous. It also occurs in respect to men. Thus in the gospels man is acknowledged and dealt with as righteous (Matt. xii. 37), in contrast to *καταδικασθῆναι*, to be condemned; man also pronounces and declares himself to be righteous (Luke x. 29; xvi. 15: *ἐναντίον τῶν ἀνθρώπων*; cf. 1 Cor. iv. 4); or it is God who acknowledges and treats the sinner as righteous (Luke xviii. 14: *δεδικαιωμένος*; cf. *ὑψωθήσεται*, ver. 14, and *ἰλάσθητι τῷ ἁμαρτωλῷ*, ver. 13). Among the apostles, except Rev. xxii. 11, we find the expression in Paul and James only: in the latter, in ch. ii. 21, 24, 25, cf. 23; in Paul, in Acts xiii. 39, cf. 38; 1 Cor. iv. 4, vi. 11; Tit. iii. 7; Gal. ii. 16, 17, iii. 8, 11, 24, v. 4; in the Epistle to the Romans, in the first negative section, ii. 13, iii. 20; and in the positive section, iii. 24, 26, 28, 30, iv. 2 (cf. 3–9, 22, 25), v. 1, 9 (cf. 10, 11, 16–21); also in the later chapters, vi. 7, viii. 30. The noun is *δικαίωσις* (Rom. iv. 25, v. 18). It is evident that Paul and James always use *δικαιοῦν* in the sense of *esteeming, pronouncing, and treating as righteous*, both according to the measure of the law (Rom. ii. 13, iii. 20), and also according to grace. The latter is the case in the Epistle to the Galatians, and also in the positive section of that to the Romans. Here the justification of the sinner before God is evidently that which is meant,—that man, although not justified by the law, is esteemed and treated as righteous by God.

In all these passages, therefore, the fundamental meaning of *δικαιοῦν* is the *forensic and judicial* signification. In the passages of the first class, that is, those which refer to a legal standpoint, we see in Rom. ii. 13 that *δικαιωθήσονται* is parallel with the *δίκαιοι παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ* (in God's judgment) in antithesis to *κριθήσονται* and *ἀπολοῦνται* (ver. 12); also, in Rom. iii. 30, that *οὐ δικαιωθήσεται πᾶσα σὰρξ* is parallel with *ὑπόδικος τῷ Θεῷ* (ver. 19). In the passages of the second class this sense is unmistakably evident, both from the contrasts presented, and also from positive explanations which more exactly define it. With respect to the latter, it is unquestionable that the sinner, who is liable to the divine displeasure and judgment, is described as the subject of the *δικαιοῦσθαι*. Thus Rom. iii. 24, cf. ver. 23, 19, 20, 9; also iv. 5 (*ἀσεβής*): hence this subject *δικαιοῦται* only as a gift (*δωρεάν*, Rom. iii. 24); by faith and not by works (Rom. iii. 26, 30); by grace (Rom. iii. 24); not by merit (Rom. iv. 4);

by means of the redemption of Christ as the atonement (Rom. iii. 24, 25). It is, moreover, unquestionable that *δικαιοῦν* is explained by Paul as an *imputation of righteousness*—*λογίζεσθαι δικαιοσύνην* (Rom. iv. 6, cf. v. 22)—to a subject who is not *δίκαιος* in himself (Rom. iv. 5); and this imputation includes, indeed, the *forgiveness of sins* (Rom. iv. 6-9; cf. Acts xiii. 38, 39), man thus having peace with God (Rom. v. 1), and standing in a friendly relation with Him, being no longer His enemy, but reconciled to Him (Rom. v. 9, cf. x. 11). The contrast to *δικαιοῦν* is therefore *ἐγκαλεῖν*, to *accuse* (Rom. viii. 33). The antithesis of *δικαίωσις* is *κατάκριμα* (Rom. v. 18). Whosoever is not justified (*δικαιοῦνται*) is liable to punishment, and under the curse (Gal. iii. 11, cf. x. 13). From all this there can be no doubt as to the forensic character of the word *δικαιοῦν* as used by Paul.

The opposite interpretation, which understands *δικαιοῦν* as *making righteous*, has been brought forward by the rationalistic party, faith being looked upon as a faithfulness of conviction; it has also been advanced by the supernatural, especially Catholic party, justification being blended with sanctification, and bound up, not with faith, but with love and good works, the former being united to the works. Not only the signification of the word itself, but the context everywhere, is opposed to this view.

God being He who pronounces and treats the sinner as righteous, this justification, more closely considered, involves (1) that *sin is not imputed to the sinner as guilt* (Rom. iv. 5-8; Gal. iii. 11, 13; Acts xiii. 39, 38; Rom. iv. 7). This follows from the contrast to justification, *ἐγκαλεῖν* and *κατόκριμα* (Rom. viii. 33, v. 18), and the words *μὴ λογιζόμενος τὰ παραπτώματα* (2 Cor. v. 19). (2) Positively, that *faith is counted to the sinner as righteousness* (Rom. iv. 5; Phil. iii. 9). *Peace* (*ἡ εἰρήνη πρὸς τὸν Θεόν*, Rom. v. 1) is conditional on these two points, and thus the relation between God and man is constituted so that we have access to God (Rom. v. 2; cf. Eph. ii. 14). We are thus reconciled to God (Rom. v. 10, 11; 2 Cor. v. 20), and have the assurance of the divine love to us, this love being spread abroad in our hearts (Rom. v. 5). Enmity has departed, and we know ourselves to be *τέκνοι Θεοῦ* (Rom. viii. 14-17; Gal. iv. 6, 7). Thus, too, we have the *καυχᾶσθαι ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσιν* (Rom. v. 3), and the hope which "maketh not ashamed" (Rom. v. 5); also the *ἐλπὶς τῆς δόξης τοῦ Θεοῦ* (Rom. viii. 24). The consciousness

both of reconciliation and sonship being conditional on faith, is not possible without the Holy Spirit, through whom we obtain faith (1 Cor. xii. 3), and the lively consciousness of God's love to us (Rom. v. 5), and of our being His children (Rom. viii. 16). Thus justification is nothing but the atonement rendered subjective and brought to consciousness.

As justification depends only on the divine word of grace, of which we become assured by faith, *all works of the law and all ground for self-glory are excluded*. Faith is in itself a renunciation of one's own personal sufficiency and moral desert; it is the *κατὰ Θεὸν λύπη* (2 Cor. vii. 10). The *ἔργα νόμου* are works which are in conformity to the law,—first of all the Old Testament law, but also the moral law generally. They are therefore not merely works of the ceremonial law, as the Catholics and the ancient and modern Rationalists would put it. The second chapter of the Epistle to the Romans shows that the question is as to general morals; and the expression *ἔργα νόμου* alternates without any alteration in the sense with the idea of *ἔργα* generally (cf. Eph. ii. 9; Rom. iv. 2; Tit. iii. 5; 2 Tim. i. 9). In Rom. ii. 13 the apostle expressly declares that the *ποιηταὶ τοῦ νόμου* are righteous before God: the circumcision of the heart is of value in God's sight (Rom. ii. 28, 29). Both the Jew and the Gentile who work good (vers. 26, 17, cf. 14) would have a place before God (ver. 10); the sin of both is an infringement of the law (ch. ii. 12, 13, 21–24, cf. 26, 27). This is also clear from ch. iv. 4. The expression that the law cannot justify us (Gal. iii. 11, 21; Rom. iii. 21) only states the matter of fact. But the law, the fulfilment of which would justify, is the moral law, and not a merely ceremonial law. The antithesis of the *ἔργα* is not morality, but the grace, *χάρις*, which is contrasted with merit (Rom. iv. 4, *κατὸ ὀφείλημα*). It must have been very far from the apostle's mind to assume that the law was something which, working externally and from material motives, produced a mere legality; indeed, the very contrary is plain from Rom. ii. 12 ff.; and this is quite in harmony with the statement in Rom. vii. 14. The impotence of the law is based on the sinful nature, the *σὰρξ* of men. And this is so much the case, that the moral law, even when inwardly felt and willed, cannot justify (Rom. vii.), because there is no power of fulfilment to combine with the assenting will. In the wide and general sense, which results from these

considerations, the *ἔργα νόμου* are to be understood as inadequate for the justification of man (Gal. iii. 21; Rom. ii. 5-10). For the Jews, at all events, the works of the statutory law were inseparably included in the law of God and its moral obligation; hence, therefore, the inability of the *ἔργα* and that of the *περιτομή* coincide. Faith begins with the knowledge of the inadequacy of the law, and then avails itself of the grace which makes free.

§ 83. *The Salvation of Individuals—The New Life of Righteousness.*

The new life, just as justification itself, is necessarily bound up with faith. Faith of itself is not the sufficient intervening cause of justification. This cause is only the objective divine redemption, *ἀπολύτρωσις*, the grace of God, and the atonement which is thereby established (Rom. iii. 24, 25), the fruits of which are appropriated by faith. Justification comes as a gift; but, without the susceptibility of faith, this gift, presented to us through God's grace and the mediation of Christ, would not come into our possession. Indeed, faith itself is represented in Rom. v. as a divine action; and we could not have the full feeling of faith without the Spirit of God (cf. 2 Cor. v. 14). In Paul's view, faith not only refers to justification, but is also the commencement of the new life, and is so in two respects: on the one hand, it is the first point of a continuous divine operation, and on the other, it is subjectively a principle developing itself in a human life. In virtue of the justification by faith, we have entered into the actual possession of divine grace, with which is united the hope of future glorification. Through this joyful certainty of justification the Holy Ghost is shed abroad in our hearts, and thus the first essential step is taken towards the fulfilment of all those points which in Rom. viii. 29, 30 form a continuous and inwardly connected series. Through faith Christ dwells in our *καρδιά* as an active divine principle (Eph. iii. 17). Thus the *δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ*, which first of all is a divine act applied to us, becomes a personal possession and attribute of the individual, and leads to a divinely effected renunciation of sin, and to the dominion of the divine principle with which we are in fellowship. The progress of the apostle's ideas towards the end of the fifth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans shows how the *δικαιοσύνη* assumes this subjective character; and in the beginning of the sixth chapter an application of this is made to actual life. In order to explain

the nature of *δικαιοσύνη* up to this point from ch. iii. 23, Paul has discussed that side of it which consists in justification, not only in general (Rom. iii. 23–26), but with special reference both to the conditions on which *δικαιοσύνη* depends, viz. faith in contrast to the fulfilment of the law (Rom. iii. 27–iv. 24), and also to its origin as being effected through the death and resurrection of Christ (Rom. iv. 24–v. 11), the type of Adam the first man (Rom. v. 12–21). Now, however, Paul dwells upon the other aspect of *δικαιοσύνη*, showing that it includes an inward tendency and power of life which is entirely opposed to sin. For, says Paul, so far from the doctrine of justification containing any ground for continuing in sin, it, on the contrary, directly involves the moral necessity for a new divine life (Rom. vi. 1–23), inasmuch as believers are in fellowship with Christ, that is, with His death and resurrection (Rom. vi. 2–14), and therefore are no longer under the law, but under grace, as the new ruling principle which leads to *ζωὴ αἰώνιος* (Rom. vi. 14–23). And thus, subjectively considered, and under the presupposition of divine justification, the whole nature of life which is prescribed for the Christian is now unfolded: faith is the principle of love (Gal. v. 6), and this is nothing but a reflection in the Christian himself of the divine love which has been assured to him in justification. Thus faith becomes on this side also the root of a new life of actual righteousness. This new life of righteousness is, however, now more exactly explained by Paul from a standpoint which combines both the objective and subjective points of view, that is, as the life which is in fellowship with Christ, being rooted in faith.

The connection of this new position is set forth both in the Epistle to the Galatians and also in that to the Romans. By faith, *Christ Himself*—this is the starting-point—is the principle which lives in believers, and brings about in them an organic unity of life with Him. Faith is both the requirement for justification and also effects this fellowship with Christ. Faith, as combined with baptism, is an appropriation of Christ (cf. Gal. ii. 16–21, iii. 26, 27; Phil. iii. 12; Rom. vi. 1–11). In the last-named chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, Paul, as already remarked, passes on from the subject of justification to that of the new life in Christ. As previously sin, now grace, reigns *διὰ δικαιοσύνης*; and this reigning grace is no longer mere justification, but is actual righteous-

ness, inasmuch as we, through this grace and the unity with Christ which is now effected, have become dead to sin, just as Christ died on account of sin (Rom. vi. 4 ff.). The almost proverbial sentence, that sin and the guilt of sin cease with death (Rom. vi. 7), is applied to the figurative death, the death of the old man in us, which is the result of our fellowship in faith with Christ. Not only does something take place in us which is similar to the death of Christ by which sin was subdued, but this effect stands in causal connection with this His death. The *ἀποθανεῖν* (Rom. vi. 8) is not an act or purpose of the human will, but is an event which is brought about by the objective effect of the death of Christ, and in the fellowship of faith is conveyed to the subject; it is the justification from sin as well as the liberation from its power (cf. Col. ii. 11, 12). The great change which comes upon man is the *περιτομή Χριστοῦ*, a spiritual event similar in a higher sense to circumcision,—an event which is effected by Christ, and consists in the *ἀπέκδυσις τοῦ σώματος τῆς σαρκός*, the spiritual renunciation of the body of sin, *i.e.* the flesh; but this change also leads to a new life similar to, and dependent on, the resurrection of Christ. This change is brought about by faith,—a faith which is produced by God as the principle of life, just as He raised up Jesus. The connection between the death of Christ and the death of the old man in us, and that between His resurrection and a new life in us, is therefore the same (Rom. vi. 9; Col. ii. 13, cf. iii. 3; Eph. ii. 5). Now, however, the grace of God reigns, which is equivalent to Christ reigning. *Χάρις* and *Χριστός* now stand in the place of *ἁμαρτία* and *θάνατος* (Rom. v. 21, vi. 9 ff., 14); and His dominion is shown by His becoming the principle of our personal life (Gal. ii. 20; 2 Cor. v. 15). As Christ not only withstood sin in His own person unto death, but also suffered death for the atonement for, and redemption from, sin, so it is the same principle which in us crucifies the flesh (Gal. v. 24), withstands sin (Eph. vi. 13), and produces an obedience unto death (Rom. xiv. 4, 8; Phil. i. 21), so that we now live to God as Christ the risen One lives (Rom. vi. 10, 11).

In virtue of this new life in Christ, it now comes to pass that we are *free from the law*. Its rule has ceased, because the position of man for which the law was prescribed is come to an end (Gal. iv. 1-7; Rom. vii. 1-3). Hence the two comparisons of

the law with merely temporary positions,—in one passage with childhood and guardianship, in the other with a marriage dissolved by death, and with the relative obligation in each case. But another cause of the freedom from the dominion of the law is, that now a higher dispensation, instead of the power of the law, has actually presented itself to man (Gal. iv. 4, 5). He is become the property of another, and, in the *πνεῦμα*, has received a new element of life (Gal. iv. 6 ; Rom. viii. 16), which is opposed to the *γράμμα* (2 Cor. iii. 6 ; Rom. vii. 6), and is the element of a new freedom (Gal. v. 1, 2). Man has thus become a *καινή κτίσις* (2 Cor. v. 17 ; Gal. vi. 15, cf. v. 6) ; he is the *καινὸς* or *νέος ἄνθρωπος* (Eph. iv. 24 ; Col. iii. 10, cf. 9).

Thus the man who has passed from the law into the life of the Spirit now actually serves righteousness with all his powers (Rom. vii. 6, vi. 12–14) ; he walks in the Spirit (Rom. viii. 4, cf. 9). For the new man is in righteousness, and he is *κτισθεὶς ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ ὁσιότητι τῆς ἀληθείας* (Eph. iv. 24) : it has become an actual power of life in him, as the law of the Spirit (Rom. viii. 2), as freedom (2 Cor. iii. 17), and as childship (Gal. iv. 4–7 ; Rom. viii. 15 f.). This new freedom is at the same time an inward moral obligation (Rom. vi. 18 ff.) ; and thus a life is developed, which manifests itself outwardly in “faith, hope, and charity” (1 Cor. xiii. 13 ; 1 Thess. i. 3). In faith the Christian entirely surrenders himself to God and Christ ; in hope he meets the termination of this life ; in charity or love this life is proved to be a divine power, and love is called the greatest of the three, because in it the new life is most forcibly manifested. This new life pervades the totality of man’s being, and a whole organism of virtues appertains to the nature of the new man (Col. iii. 12 ; Eph. iv. 24 ff. ; Gal. v. 22) : he strives for all that is lovely and worthy of praise (Phil. iv. 8, 9) ; in the spirit of Jesus he is just in all the human relations of life (Eph. v. 22 ff. ; Col. iii. 18 ff. ; 1 Cor. vii. ; Rom. xiii. 1 ff. ; 1 Tim. iii. 1 ff., v. 1 ff.) ; all that he does is done in the name of Jesus (Col. iii. 17). The whole shape of his being is changed by the renewing of his mind into a similarity, not to the spirit of the world, but to the perfect will of God : he dedicates his body as a temple of God and as a sacrifice well-pleasing to Him (1 Cor. vi. 19, 20 ; Rom. xii. 1). The Apostle Paul has more than any other applied the great principles of Christianity to the whole life,

and has left behind him precepts for every province of Christian ethics.

In this *sanctification* the man *continually progresses*, for sin is subdued, although not destroyed. Sin, therefore, is still active, so that in this world the new life is never quite consummated, but there is need of constant watchfulness, purifying, and improvement (cf. Gal. v. 17; Rom. viii. 12 f.); by these it is ever more and more perfected (2 Cor. vii. 1) and also by a continuous renewal (2 Cor. iv. 16), which is a constant glorification (2 Cor. iii. 18). Another attribute of the new life is *peace*, which it derives from the God of peace (1 Thess. v. 23), who has given the witness of our sonship through His Spirit, and thus, together with justification, has established this new life (Gal. iv. 6; Rom. viii. 15, 16). The word *regeneration* occurs only once in Paul's writings (Tit. iii. 5). The fact itself is, however, most distinctly expressed in the oft-named figure, that, having died and risen again with Christ, we have obtained a new commencement of life.

§ 84. *Salvation in Individuals—Completion thereof in Christ.*

According to Rom. viii. 1, if Christ is in us, there is for us no longer a *κατάκριμα* (cf. ver. 2). Those in whom He is (ver. 10) are also *κατὰ πνεῦμα περιπατοῦντες* (ver. 4). The body, indeed, is subject to death on account of sin; the spirit, however, already has *ζωή* on account of righteousness (vers. 10, 11); for the Spirit Himself, in whom we are, is life, and brings peace in Himself,—a peace which keeps both heart and mind in Christ (Phil. iv. 7). Its positive expression is the witness of the divine Spirit to our sonship (Rom. viii. 15, 16; Gal. iv. 6, 7). The feeling of sonship gives the power of bearing all sufferings (Rom. viii. 35, 28; 2 Cor. iv. 9 ff., etc.); in it affliction is a suffering in the sense of the sufferings of Christ, for Christ's sake (Col. i. 24); and all our actions and life tend to enhance our consciousness that our justification is a free gift.

In the present time our sonship is only a commencing one. It is established in principle, but awaits a future consummation (Rom. viii. 23), together with the redemption of our bodies from all evil. This will be our glorification with Him, the *συνδοξασθῆναι*, the future participation in the perfected glory of Christ (ver. 17), or the full manifestation in our persons of Christ as our life (Col. iii. 4).

§ 85. *Salvation as regards the Church—The Church of Christ.*

The idea of an *organically united fellowship* is represented by Paul under the figure of the body (Rom. xii. 5; 1 Cor. x. 17, xii. 12 ff.; Eph. i. 23, iv. 4, v. 30 ff.; Col. i. 18, 24, ii. 19); also of the building of a temple (1 Cor. iii. 16, 17; 2 Cor. vi. 16; Eph. ii. 20–22),—Christ being the Corner-stone in this case, in the former the Head. It is a great unity, embracing and thus removing all national distinctions (Gal. iii. 28; Col. iii. 11; cf. Eph. iv. 4): all the differences of nation, position, and race are surmounted by the Spirit, and nothing of this kind can stand in the way of the spread of this fellowship in all its fulness and depth. The great barrier between the Gentiles and the theocracy is now removed, and the new community can therefore unfold its boundless extent (Eph. ii. 14, cf. iii. 8; Col. i. 6, 23 ff.; Rom. x. 12; Rom. i. 16). In the figure of the organism, two points are involved,—the all-pervading, quickening unity of a life (Eph. iv. 4, v. 25) with the manifold gifts which work together in it, and the individual life of the members (1 Cor. xii.).

The actual position of the fellowship or Church does not, of course, correspond to the ideal conception of it. This fact is by no means overlooked by Paul, although he always views and addresses the churches as a collection of those who have been called and sanctified. He well knew that there were many non-genuine members in the outward community of Christians, who could not be properly elements in this fellowship (cf. 1 Cor. v., vi.; Col. ii. 19; 2 Tim. ii. 19–21, etc.); but this fact does not affect the continuance of the true Church, inasmuch as, being in connection with its Lord, it can never want for real and genuine members. Similarly, in spite of this fact, the gradual development of the Church proceeds, and being the body of Christ, possesses inherently His fulness (Eph. iv. 16, iii. 19). The Church grows uninterruptedly, and assumes to itself the entire fulness of God's gifts. This progress takes place, of course, amid much conflict, in which we must press forward through the present wicked *αἰών* (Gal. i. 4; Eph. ii. 2) to the *αἰών* which is future.

The *continuance and development* of the Church *depends*, therefore, *entirely on Christ*, into community with whom men enter, and are established therein in virtue of the divine redemption and calling (1 Cor. i. 9). This participation is therefore not of

an incidental character; it depends on a divine preparation, which not only sets forth as actually presupposed the work of Christ and the sacraments, but also specially ordains the participation of the individual. The participation in the fellowship with Christ is, in Paul's view, conditional on an eternal act of election,—the whole divine work of salvation depending, indeed, on this divine purpose (cf. § 81). The calling to the participation follows according to an inscrutable rule of divine wisdom, to which rule no limits are placed (Col. i. 6, 23; Rom. x. 12); and hence by it the barrier is removed between God's peculiar people and other nations (Eph. ii. 14 f., cf. ver. 22).

The ordinances which are presupposed and set forth by the dispensation of the divine election are the *Word*, *Baptism*, and the *Lord's Supper*. By means of baptism, elect believers enter into fellowship with Him, and through the Lord's Supper are confirmed in the same. For a right understanding of the passages which deal with baptism, such as Rom. vi. 2 ff., Gal. iii. 27 f., Tit. iii. 5, Eph. iv. 5, we must note that, wherever its effects and full significance are spoken of, it is evident that a baptism received in faith is presupposed; and it is thus a putting on of Christ, and therefore a reception of the Holy Spirit. It thus becomes a washing of regeneration, and in it is involved the power which unites all in ἐν σῶμα.

Paul speaks in detail of the Lord's Supper in 1 Cor. x. and xi., in order to inculcate its proper celebration. It is called the δείπνον κυριακόν, the τράπεζα Κυρίου, and the elements τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας and ὁ ἄρτος, etc. It is a repast for a thankful and believing remembrance, but also becomes a communion of the body and blood of Christ (1 Cor. x. 16). This κοινωνία might indeed be possibly of a figurative and ideal character, by the participating believer being stirred up to a remembrance of Jesus and His death; but the remarks in 1 Cor. xi. 27–29 appear to be in favour of a *real* participation, for that which we partake of is the σῶμα τοῦ Κυρίου. The reference to the fellowship which we have with one another (1 Cor. x. 17) appears, however, to be the express consequence of this real participation in common in Christ; also in 1 Cor. xii. 13, where ἐποτίσθημεν appears to point to the Lord's Supper (cf. x. 2–4, with this hint as to the spiritual food of the new covenant), the union being described as the result of some such real participation. Certainly

no indubitable exegetical proof can be brought forward for this real view; but very high probability is afforded to it by the Pauline system of thought, wherein the dead and risen Christ is the condition for our life and rules in it. Thus it is probable that He who lives in us, and through whom we live (Gal. ii. 20), who, too, will make our *σῶμα τῆς ταπεινώσεως* like His *σῶμα τῆς δόξης* (Phil. iii. 21), should place Himself in some such real relation to us,—a relation which would have the effect of glorifying our collective life.

§ 86. *The Kingdom of Christ and the Power of Darkness.*

The apostle speaks of *a great whole*, the *Head of which is Christ*, which through Him, and especially through His death, is united in a living unity (Eph. i. 10; Gal. i. 20). Christ is thus the Head of the whole spirit-world (Col. ii. 10, cf. i. 16). There is a great family of God in heaven and on earth (Eph. iii. 15, cf. 10), which forms a kingdom of Christ as the Son of God (Col. i. 13; cf. 2 Tim. iv. 18), and therefore a kingdom of God Himself, the *βασιλεία Θεοῦ* (1 Thess. ii. 12; cf. Rom. xiv. 17, where it is represented from the subjective side).

This large view of Christ's work, as extending to the whole universe (Eph. i. 10), is the *μυστήριον* mentioned in ver. 9,—the *μυστήριον* of the purpose which He formed of the dispensation fitted for the fulness of times, namely, that all, the whole universe, and first of all the created beings both in heaven and earth, should be united in Christ. The effect of redemption, therefore, was to be not merely the conformity of earthly life to His idea,—the union of men with God,—but also the restoration of a harmony in the universe. The glance which, in Rom. viii. 19 ff., seems to attribute to the irrational creation a share in the purchased freedom, now rises to a view of the great unity of the heavenly and earthly world. The more exact reference of this union to the work of redemption is set forth in Col. i. 20. In this passage we must doubtless understand the *τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς* to mean the personal dwellers in heaven, therefore the angel-world. This view alone corresponds with the aim of the epistle, which endeavours to put down the exaggerated veneration for angels, and with this view shows that even the highest finite spirits are only co-members of the great union which was established through Christ and His death, and therefore stand in a friendly

relation to us, but only through Him, our and their Lord. Certainly the atoning work of Jesus is not directly in question here, as that from which this union results; for ἀποκαταλλάξαι cannot be understood of the reconciliation of men with God,—a reference which is excluded by the preposition εἰς αὐτόν. It is a reconciliation, the tendency of which is to Jesus, so that it must serve His ends, in which He also appears as the first in everything,—everything being not only *through* Him, but also *for* Him. Now this reconciliation is nothing but the mutual union of the members,—this being also explained in εἰρηνοποιήσας, which must be taken transitively. In this reconciliation and union of men, both among themselves and also with the higher spirit-world, is included of course their reconciliation with God, as without this presupposition the former would not be possible. In becoming children of God through this reconciliation and union, they also become one with the children of light in heaven; and thus this union follows διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ σταυροῦ αὐτοῦ.

According to this view, *Christ is the Head not only of the Church* (Col. i. 18), *but also*, and in entirely the same sense, *of all supernatural principalities and powers* (Col. ii. 10; Eph. i. 21, cf. iii. 10; 1 Pet. iii. 22); wherefore all these powers cannot sever us from Him and the love of God in Him (Rom. viii. 38, 39). This quite corresponds with the position which, as the instrument of creation (Col. i. 16), He assumes over all these powers. Through Christ there is one great family of God in heaven and on earth (Eph. iii. 15). Every race in heaven and on earth has its name from the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; that is, that both the earthly and also the heavenly family of God are called children through Him and by Him, and are therefore one great family (cf. Eph. iii. 10). In Col. i. 13 the βασιλεία τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ points to this great circle, of which, by means of the redemption, we form a part.

According to Col. i. 13, this kingdom is opposed by the *power of darkness*, which, under Satan, prevails among mankind by means of sin and death (Eph. ii. 2, vi. 11, 12). In principle, it is already subdued by the atoning death of Christ (Col. ii. 15; 1 Cor. xv. 24–28); but because the development of His kingdom in His Church on earth is to realize this victory, it is therefore continuously engaged in a conflict with the power of darkness.

In Col. i. 13 the ἐξουσία τοῦ σκότους, the power of (moral)

darkness, is mentioned, to which we belonged, as being under an involuntary influence. The passage in the Epistle to the Ephesians shows how this is to be understood, and that this influence is based on a personal and wicked ruling will. In Eph. ii. 2 the *ἐξουσία* is the power of the kingdom of evil, which is doubtless to be understood as being divided into a multitude of individual beings. Its sphere is the air, *ὁ ἀήρ*. Its ruler is the *ἄρχων*—Satan, *σατανᾶς* (Rom. xvi. 20 ; 1 Cor. v. 5, vii. 5 ; 2 Cor. ii. 11, xi. 14 ; 1 Thess. ii. 18 ; 2 Thess. ii. 9 ; 1 Tim. i. 20, v. 15) ; *διάβολος* (Eph. vi. 11 ; 1 Tim. iii. 6, 7 ; 2 Tim. ii. 26) ; *ὁ πονηρός* (Eph. vi. 16 ; 2 Thess. iii. 3 (?)) ; *ὁ πειράζων* (1 Thess. iii. 5) ; the *θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου* (2 Cor. iv. 4). The addition *τοῦ πνεύματος* (Eph. iii. 2) shows that no physical being or action is to be attributed to them, this power being thus described as spiritually active. In Eph. vi. 11, 12, this *ἐξουσία* is again looked upon as a plurality of wicked spirits, and the addition *ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις* (cf. Eph. i. 3, 20, ii. 6, iii. 19) is probably parallel to the *ἀήρ* in Eph. ii. 2, and is consequently to be taken in a somewhat wider sense than elsewhere.

As may be gathered from Col. ii. 15, these *powers* were in principle *overcome by the death of Jesus*. He has despoiled them,—that is, of their power,—and having made a show of them openly, hath celebrated His triumph over them. This is effected by the power of sin over man, which was in their hands, being broken by His atoning death. It is unquestionable that only wicked spirits are here spoken of ; for there was no disgraceful subjection as regarded the good spirits, who acknowledged the rule of the glorified Christ. Notwithstanding this victory in principle, the power of the world of wicked spirits partially continues, just as sin itself. The conflict, therefore, against this power must also be kept up (Eph. vi. 11, 12). The passage 1 Cor. xv. 24–28 shows that this conflict is a conflict carried on by the whole kingdom of Christ, indeed by Christ Himself, and not by the redeemed individually ; it must therefore result in certain victory in the end.

§ 87. *The Consummation of Salvation, both for Individuals and the Community.*

However certain may be the ultimate victory in the conflict with the kingdom of darkness, still Paul has neither looked upon

the conflict as one becoming less and less sharp, nor is the victory in his view a gradual one. The hindrance is caused by the energetic and positive nature of sin; for this involves the fact that sin will again and again concentrate its energy, and that, therefore, in its progress of development, the opposition will more and more tend to reach its culminating point. The conflict will become sharper and sharper, although the final victory is none the less certain. This train of thought entirely makes good the idea that the appearance of Antichrist will immediately precede the manifestation of Christ (2 Thess. ii. 1-12).

The *complete manifestation of Jesus* is His ἀποκάλυψις (1 Cor. i. 7; 2 Thess. i. 7); παρουσία (1 Cor. i. 8, or ἡμέρα, xv. 23; 1 Thess. ii. 19, iii. 13, iv. 15, v. 23; 2 Thess. ii. 1, 8); ἐπιφάνεια (1 Tim. vi. 14; 2 Tim. iv. 1; Tit. ii. 13); φανεροῦσθαι (Col. iii. 4). The most developed teaching on this point is given in 1 Thess. iv. 13 ff.; and this view is in harmony with the description in Rom. xi. 25 ff. of the crisis brought on by the conversion of the Jewish nation.

With the cessation of the conflict and the consummation of the kingdom, the previous form of the kingdom itself also changes. This is the sense of the passage (1 Cor. xv. 24-28), according to which Christ gives up His dominion. After the removal of all opposition to the realization of salvation, *God is all in all*; and thus the order of things ceases in which Christ rules His kingdom with a view of subduing all opposition. The last enemy which is to be overcome in this contest is death, and this is done by the resurrection. But in this passage the question is undecided, whether, in Paul's view, this victory extends to all those who are subject to death, and that consequently all shall enter into the number of those who in ver. 23 are described as οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ,—whether, indeed, the expression in ver. 28 is to be taken in the fullest and strongest sense of the word, or with a certain limitation. On the other hand, there is no doubt that the apostle has elsewhere spoken of an eternal damnation, and so spoken, indeed, that it cannot be understood hypothetically; for in 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10, he threatens an exclusion from God's kingdom; likewise in 2 Thess. i. 9 still more categorically. It is especially improbable that the apostle intended to give any hope of restitution to the culmination of sin mentioned in 2 Thess. ii.; therefore all that we can say is, that the apostle in different

sections speaks from different standpoints, and that, at all events, in his doctrinal system we have no tenable proof of any final general abolition of sin.

The perfecting of the bodily life is a special element in the consummation of Christ's kingdom (2 Cor. v. 1 ff.; 1 Cor. xv.; Phil. iii. 21). The most detailed teaching as to the general resurrection is given by the apostle in the passage 1 Cor. xv. Christ is the first-born from the dead (Col. i. 18; Rom. viii. 29; 1 Cor. xv. 20). His resurrection is followed by ours (1 Cor. xv. 23), and every one follows *ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ τάγματι*. The resurrection itself, the nature of which the apostle explains in 1 Cor. xv. 35–50, takes place at Christ's return in a twofold mode: on the one hand, it is an actual resurrection of the dead out of corruption; and on the other, as regards the living, it is only a change (1 Cor. xv. 51 ff.).

The *perfected position* of believers is described as *δόξα* (Rom. v. 2, viii. 18; Eph. i. 18),—a position to which they have been destined from eternity (Rom. viii. 29, 30). This *δόξα* of believers depends upon the *δόξα* of Christ, and is a participation in Christ's glory (Rom. viii. 17, 29). It is therefore called “the hope of glory” (Col. i. 27), and is based on the divine fulness as chiefly shown in His grace (Eph. i. 6); hence God is called (Eph. i. 17) *ὁ πατήρ τῆς δόξης*, and the glory destined for believers (Rom. v. 2) *δόξα τοῦ Θεοῦ*.

In the remarkable passage Rom. viii. 19 ff., the Apostle Paul has expressed the idea that the glorifying effect of the consummation of Christ's kingdom extends to the *whole of creation*, even to impersonal nature. In this passage he extols the high blessedness of the Christian, although, indeed, not yet completed, but still subject to sufferings; and, in the first place, refers to the position of the creation, which seems to point to some future glorification, just as the position of Christians. Hence the glorification of the Christian forms an essential element of that glorification which is impending over the whole creation (vers. 19–23). That *κτίσις* here refers to the inanimate creation, in distinction from men, is clear, if we consider two points: on the one hand, that a contrast to Christians is thus established; and on the other, the *κτίσις* is not described as a subject burdened by sin, but only as liable to *ματαιότης*—perishableness. Linguistic usage, the predicates, and the connection of the section,

are all in favour of this explanation. Through the will of the Creator,—for the *ὑποτάξας* is God, and not either man or the devil,—nature is subject to perishableness, which lies upon it as a curse. But as this curse, and the woe thereof, are bound up with the necessity of death, which is based upon sin (vers. 22, 23), so nature itself will have its share in the impending glorification of the children of God (ver. 21). And as the present incompleteness and needs of nature seem to point to their future glorification, thus the view involved in this prediction is a warranty for the future glorification of the children of God. The connection between this view of the present and future position of creation, and the hope of the human life of Christians, is best shown by a comparison of this section with the passage in 2 Cor. v. 1–8, which is so allied to the former in its whole tone, and testifies so fully to the oppression exercised by the bodily existence and the longing for a heavenly clothing.

§ 88. *Reference to God of the Restoration to Righteousness.*

The apostle's teaching as to the person and work of Jesus, and his acknowledgment of God as the eternal foundation of this salvation, are comprehended by him in the prayer expressed in 2 Cor. xiii. 14, which, although only combining the three principles of salvation, still traces them back to their divine causality, and comprehends them in their unity. The words in 1 Cor. xv. 28, that God will finally be all in all, have an explanatory parallel in another passage (Eph. iv. 6), according to which God is the Lord exalted above us all, who worketh through all (*i.e.* makes all His instruments) and is in us all, thus realizing for us a share in His grace and love. Thus the apostle goes back to the highest views of salvation having its beginning in the Divine Being; but he does not argue from them in the abstract, but only treats them as a presupposition belonging to the great course of redemption.

In the separate points of the work of redemption, the various divine attributes are therefore manifested in all their greatness and glory. Thus God's wisdom is shown therein in all its manifold character (Eph. iii. 10); also His love to those alienated from Him (Rom. v. 8), and His grace (Eph. ii. 7); His righteousness as modified by love (Rom. iii. 25, 26); His omnipotence as quickening those both bodily and spiritually dead (Eph. i. 19, 20, ii. 5; cf. Rom. iv. 17, 21, 24). All these attributes are manifested

both in the purpose and plan of the whole dispensation of salvation, and also in the separate stages and points of its realization, to His eternal glorification (Rom. xi. 36 ; Eph. i. 12-14, iii. 21 ; Phil. ii. 11).

§ 89. *Comparison of the Pauline System of Doctrine with other Scriptures of the New Testament, especially the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Writings of Luke.*

As regards the *writings of Luke*, we have already seen in the introduction and the historical division of this part, that the real groundwork of the Acts of the Apostles is to be found, not only in the aim of representing the Apostle Paul as the divinely authorized apostle of the Gentiles, but also in the idea of the universality of Christianity, which was so pre-eminently set forth by Paul. The author makes the apostle himself briefly describe the Pauline doctrine of justification in one of his discourses (Acts xiii. 38, 39). Besides, both Paul himself, in 1 Cor. xii. 1 ff. and i. 7, Gal. iii. 2-14, and also the Acts of the Apostles, similarly represent the communication of the Spirit and the gifts of the Spirit as the essential signs of Christianity (Acts ii. 23, cf. 16-18 ; viii. 15-17 ; x. 44-47, cf. xi. 15-18 ; xix. 1-6). Our first part has shown that Luke's Gospel, in the narratives and discourses which it records, sets forth the Pauline idea of justification by faith in Jesus Christ without meritorious works. With regard to this point, we must especially call to mind the Christology. The gospel commences with the supernatural conception, and herein a contradiction has been found to the Pauline doctrine of the pre-existence. But this entry into life exactly corresponds with the Pauline idea of Christ as a new starting-point of humanity, and as the quickening Spirit. The pre-existing Divine Being must, by some such event, call into existence a life in humanity, which is of course presupposed as susceptible of the same. Paul himself, moreover, has described the nature of Christ as a higher principle by the terms *πνεῦμα ζωοποιούν, πνεῦμα ἁγιοσύνης*. Adding to this the Pauline teaching as to the *σὰρξ ἁμαρτίας*, and that the sinless Christ could only appear *ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκός*, we see that, through the whole sphere of his ideas, it is put forward that Christ could not enter humanity except under the condition of the removal of the natural continuity, just as took place, according to the gospel, in the supernatural conception. It

is also remarkable that the same gospel traces back the genealogy of Jesus, not merely to Abraham, but on to Adam, and through him to God. Thus, entirely in conformity with the Pauline teaching and the universality of Christianity, Christ, as the second and higher starting-point of Christianity, is placed in contrast to the first man.

The Epistle to the Hebrews follows very closely the Pauline system, but yet it shows a certain independent development. Points which Paul kept more in the background are made leading ideas,—a fact which gives a peculiar character to the teaching,—and Pauline doctrines are decidedly placed in a different point of view. The former is especially shown in the teaching as to Christ; the latter in the positions given to the old and new covenants. The Epistle to the Hebrews also turns to the Jewish Christians with a view of bringing home to them the peculiar nature of Christianity; but this is done in a milder and less polemical mode, the fundamental idea of which is the positive connection existing between the new and higher and the earlier ordinance.

As regards the *person of Christ*, the Epistle to the Hebrews follows the Pauline passages which are fullest on the point. It takes Christ to be the *υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ* in the highest sense (ch. i. 1, cf. i. 5, 8, iii. 6, iv. 14, v. 5, 8, vi. 6, vii. 3, 28, x. 29), the *πρωτότοκος* (i. 6), who not only is to be placed above angels (i. 4 ff.), but in ver. 8 is plainly called *God*, with the attribute of everlasting existence (i. 12). For He is the *ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης*, and the *χαρακτήρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως* of God (i. 3). Quite in harmony with this, He is also the agent in the creation of the world (i. 10, i. 2); appointed by the Father heir of all things (i. 2), and the upholder of all things by the word of His power (i. 3). In this exalted conception of Christ the epistle entirely follows Paul, although there is no absolutely certain passage in which the latter calls Christ *God*. In this epistle we do not find Him designated as *Logos*, although in ch. iv. 12 f. certain predicates are laid down for the word, which might lead us to believe that the *Logos* is essentially intended, although in the first place only the preached word is spoken of.

By assuming human flesh and blood in behalf of the work of redemption (*παραπλησίως μετέσχευ*, ch. ii. 14, as *ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἡμ.*, Rom. viii. 3; cf. the *ἡμέραι τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ*, Heb.

v. 7), this Son, instead of the joy which was before Him, trod the path of suffering (Heb. xii. 2). In order to take on Him the seed of Abraham (ii. 16), He became in His humiliation a little lower than the angels (ii. 9), and was liable to the infirmities and temptations of the human life (iv. 15), even to the necessity of death (v. 7), and was like unto us in all things, but was without sin (iv. 15, vii. 26). And this it was necessary for Him to be (ii. 17), if salvation (ii. 10, v. 9), a true reconciliation (ii. 17), and a cleansing from sin (i. 3), were to be established. For we need such a Mediator and High Priest (vii. 26, iv. 15), who both felt with us in our infirmities, and yet was separate from sinners and exalted above the heavens. For on account of His sufferings is He crowned (ii. 9), and for the sake of His holy obedience is He anointed (i. 9), and exalted to the right hand of God in heaven (i. 3, 13, viii. 1, xii. 2), having received the most glorious name (i. 4); there He awaits the completion of His dominion (x. 12 f.; cf. 1 Cor. xv. 25) and the day of His glorious appearance (ix. 28).

This Christ is therefore exalted above Moses (iii. 1 f.), and even over the angels (i. 4 ff.); consequently the covenant founded through Him is superior to the "word spoken by angels" (ii. 1 ff.), just as in Paul's view (cf. Gal. iii. 19). Paul has also set forth the peculiarity of the person of Christ in contrast to the old covenant (Gal. iv. 4; Rom. viii. 3); but with him the anthropological development is always in the foreground, whilst the Epistle to the Hebrews endeavours to show that Christianity, in virtue of His person, stands infinitely higher than the Old Testament law, the latter being utterly unable to lead to that consummation which belongs to the new covenant. In this the *distinction between the Old Testament and New Testament high priests and sacrifices* is chiefly pointed out. Christ is the High Priest of our profession (iii. 1), called thereto by God (v. 5; according to the order of Melchizedek, v. 10, vi. 20), who has the attributes of purity and dignity fitting Him to be the High Priest of reconciliation (ii. 17) for the good things to come (ix. 11), and is therefore exalted to the right hand of God (viii. 1). Christ fulfils this high-priestly office both by *His death*, and also by *His action in the heavenly sanctuary above*. His death is a holy sacrifice offered in blood (ix. 14), by means of the *πνεῦμα αἰώνιον*. By this sacrifice He has borne the sins of many (ix. 28),

and has effected a redemption from all the transgressions which, under the old covenant, could have found no certain redemption (ix. 15, cf. x. 2; ix. 9). Inasmuch as He Himself was saved from death (v. 7), He has subdued the power of death, that is, the devil (ii. 14 f.), and by God's grace has died for all (ii. 9). And He has also opened the new covenant as the promise of the eternal inheritance (ix. 15), of which He is become the Mediator (viii. 6, ix. 15, xii. 24), the Surety (vii. 22), and Shepherd (xiii. 20). Through this one offering He has restored the perfect forgiveness of sins, and the new way of sanctification (x. 14-18, cf. 22-25 and viii. 10 f.), in which He is also the type and the forerunner (vi. 20, xii. 2). But, on the other hand, this sacrifice, which is represented under the figure of death producing a testament (ix. 15 ff.), is also become the entry into His second high-priestly ministry, into His heavenly high-priesthood. In His death He Himself is once for all made perfect (ii. 10, v. 9, vii. 27 f., ix. 26 ff.), and on account of it He has entered His heavenly priesthood (ix. 24), in which He is constantly in God's presence for the sake of His people (vii. 24 f.), and in the perfect sanctuary performs the most exalted ministry (viii. 1-6, cf. x. 21). This culminating point of the ascension—the entry into glory, and the ministry therein—is so forcibly set forth, that the resurrection, which is only once mentioned (xiii. 20), seems placed somewhat in the background.

This ministry of Christ is contrasted with the imperfect institutions of the old covenant. The high priests of this covenant were themselves sinful (vii. 27 f., ix. 7), and as sacrifices offered nothing but the blood of beasts (v. 1 ff.); hence these sacrifices had constantly to be repeated. For although certain *δικαιώματα* were connected with this priesthood (ix. 1), these ordinances produced no cleansing of the conscience (x. 2, ix. 9), but only of the flesh (ix. 13, cf. 10), and are therefore called a *νόμος ἐντολῆς σαρκίνης* (vii. 16). They want the promise of the divine oath (vii. 20, 28), and are therefore become obsolete (viii. 13); their weakness, deficiency, and unprofitableness are evident (viii. 7 ff., vii. 18). Thus the essential purpose of the Old Testament ordinances appears to be that of leading on by their own imperfection to something higher (vii. 19); they are an *ὑπόδειγμα* and *σκιὰ* of heavenly things (viii. 5). All this is in harmony with the Pauline ideas; but the epistle almost exclusively urges this

side of the question, and does not dwell, like Paul, on the law and its dialectics. In the epistle Moses is chiefly only a *θεράπων εἰς μαρτύριον τῶν λαληθησομένων* (iii. 5). The promises to Abraham are indeed mentioned in the Pauline mode (vi. 13, vii. 5); but principally the author takes a survey of the entire field of pre-Christian revelation, viewing it as one of incomplete preparation; the speaking of God to the fathers through the prophets (*πολυμερῶς* and *πολυτρόπως*, i. 1) and the word which was spoken by angels (ii. 2), being contrasted with the word of salvation through the Son (cf. iii. 1).

Through Christ and His ministry Christianity appears as something by means of which, in the place of the previous *cultus*, with its temple, altar, and priesthood, and its material sanctuaries and feasts typifying those above, a new standpoint of quite another kind is laid down, in which everything refers only to that which is invisible, supramundane, heavenly, and divine. This is the immense revolution which Christianity brings,—that religion is no longer bound up with any such external sanctuaries, but that, through Christ, the eternal High Priest, the holiest of holies in heaven is directly opened to the redeemed, so that their life, guided by this heavenly tendency, is henceforth a perpetual worship of God. This heavenly holiest of holies is contrasted with the earthly, material sanctuary, which only portrayed the former. The newer, better, and eternal *διαθήκη* (vii. 22, viii. 6 ff., ix. 15 ff., xii. 24, xiii. 20), resting on the great, divine oath of promise (vii. 28), hath brought eternal salvation (v. 9, cf. xiii. 20). Having become *μέτοχοι Χριστοῦ* (iii. 14), or His *οἶκος* (iii. 6, He being the Son therein), we have attained to a heavenly calling (iii. 1), heavenly gifts (vi. 4), heavenly things (ix. 23). We have the way open to us into the true holiest of holies (vi. 19); the heavenly Jerusalem, the future and abiding city, lies before us (xii. 22, xiii. 14), where the rest and the Sabbath, into which the ancients, on account of their want of faith, could not enter (iii. 19, iv. 1), await us (iii. 9 ff.). This perfect salvation is looked upon as close at hand (x. 35 ff.); through words and signs we have the full confidence of hope in it (ii. 1, iii. 4, 6), and must cling to this hope to the end (vi. 11), in faith (iv. 3) and in patience (vi. 12 ff.). For this purpose believers are endowed with the gifts of the Spirit (ii. 4, vi. 4, x. 29), and with the assistance of the divine grace (iv. 16). They are therefore

to offer their whole life to God as a sacrifice well-pleasing to Him, through the one High Priest by whom they are placed in direct connection with the heavenly holiest of holies (xiii. 15 ff.). They have the high privilege of participating in the sacrifice offered, which was a thing not permitted to those who served the tabernacle; that is, they can avail themselves of the spiritual appropriation of Christ's sacrifice, which penetrates into the whole Christian life (ver. 10), by means of which are brought about the promise of the law written in the heart (viii. 10 ff.), the purging of the conscience from dead works to serve the living God (ix. 14), and an entire purification and perfect corresponding to the heavenly character of the new covenant (cf. x. 14-18, 22-25). The difficulty of justifying themselves, if they have not remained faithful, corresponds with the greatness of their calling (vi. 4 ff., ii. 1 ff., x. 26, xii. 12 ff.).

In its subjective appropriation *faith* appears as essential, and especially in its reference to the atoning death of Christ (x. 22, cf. xi. 40); but it is also brought home to the Jewish-Christian reader by showing that it was faith by which, from the very beginning, man became well-pleasing to God (ch. xi.). The idea of faith is thus modified in a way which has called forth the assertion that this idea has nothing in common with Paul's. But what we read in ch. xi. is nothing but a peculiar shaping and application of the Pauline idea of faith, the roots of which modification closely border on the conceptions in Rom. iv. In the Epistle to the Hebrews, in the question of acceptance with God, faith is made the necessary point (xi. 6); and faith is justifying and saving, so far as it takes a lively grasp on God's heavenly promises, (xi. 1, 39 f.), and the *πατρις* is sought (xi. 14, 16).

The *Epistle to the Hebrews* is an element of our canon which is full of meaning, and, from the peculiar position which it assumes, of great value. It completes and supplements the Pauline system, showing what might grow out of this field of doctrine. By the conclusions which it begins to take, and its greater rest and positiveness in the conception of the distinction between Christianity and the old covenant, it forms an evident transition to John's system of teaching.

II. THE APOSTOLICAL TEACHING OF JOHN.

§ 90. *Our Authorities for John's System of Doctrine.*

Our view of the matter differs from that of those who take the whole of John's Gospel, including the discourses of Jesus which are recorded in it, as authorities for John's system of doctrine. The historical portion—that is, the history and the discourses of Jesus—belongs to the Messianic period. It has been asserted that, if the discourses of Jesus recorded by John are compared with the first Epistle of John, there is a peculiar affinity between the two, not only in tone and style, but also in purport, so that no difference of doctrine between them can be affirmed. There is, nevertheless, a very remarkable and unmistakeable difference. The idea of the *Logos* having been incarnate in Jesus of Nazareth is peculiar to the fourth gospel; but in the discourses recorded by John this term *Logos* is never made to proceed from the lips of Jesus Himself. In other points, also, the didactic matter of the first Epistle of John goes further than the discourses attributed by the apostle to Jesus. This is the case in the way in which the epistle speaks of the *death of Jesus*, and of Jesus as the *ἰλασμός περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν* (ch. ii. 2; iv. 10, cf. i. 7); also that the blood of Jesus cleanses from all sin, and that He was the propitiatory sacrifice, is not expressed by Jesus Himself in John's Gospel when He speaks of His death (John iii. vi. x. xii. xvii). The epistle speaks also of Christ's *παρουσία* (ch. ii. 28), which is not mentioned in this way in Jesus' discourses recorded by John. Certainly in the farewell discourses, especially ch. xvi., He speaks of His coming again; but together with an intimation of the resurrection a spiritual coming is there meant. The *παρουσία* of the epistle is, however, a glorious coming for judgment (ch. ii. 28, iv. 17), as in the Synoptists. Moreover, in the epistle, a full confidence in the hearing of prayer is expressed, but prayer *in the name of Jesus* is not mentioned. John speaks of the *χρῖσμα* of *believers* (1 John ii. 20, 27), in virtue of which they obtain divine knowledge and true consecration. Jesus says nothing of this, or of the peculiar idea expressed in 1 John v. 6, 7. John applies the term *διάβολος* (1 John iii. 8, 10, cf. John xiii. 2) to the same subject whom Jesus calls the *ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου* (John xii. 31, xiv. 30, xvi. 11; cf., however, John viii. 44). An

accurate comparison will, in general, show that in the epistle the ideas are more worked out, and that consequently the type of doctrine is far less developed in the discourses of Jesus than in the apostle's writings.

As regards the gospel, we may notice that John records certain utterances of Jesus, with the remark that they were at that time not rightly understood by the apostles (John ii. 19-22; vii. 37-39, cf. xii. 33). He therefore clearly distinguishes the thoughts of Jesus from those of the apostles, and consequently from his own personal ideas. It has been incorrectly asserted that John has allowed the discourses of Jesus, and also of other persons, to merge without distinction into his own statements. In the important passage, John iii., an accurate consideration will show that the whole train of thought, as a discourse of Jesus, follows quite naturally from the situation, and that the limits of the discourse are well defined. Against the Pharisaical opinion which awaited the Messianic judgments on the Gentiles, Jesus states that He had not come to condemn the world but to save it (vers. 16-18); and to this follows the idea that the love of light forms an element of faith (vers. 19-21), by which idea it was requisite for Nicodemus to be tested. It is just the same in other analogous cases in the gospel, such as the discourse of the Baptist (John iii. 27-36), which keeps entirely within the limits of the Baptist's ideas; for the view of the gift of the Spirit without measure and of the wrath of God belongs only to the Baptist and not to the evangelist, and what is said about the "Son of God" refers only to the event which took place at our Lord's baptism. The length of these discourses is no argument against their authenticity. That which has remained impressed on the apostle's memory is quite of an individual character; and, looking at the participation enjoyed by John in the feelings and life of our Lord, these reminiscences must not be meted out with any scanty measure. If in the form, tone, and style of Jesus' discourses we find a harmony with John's form, tone, and style, this only goes to prove that the disciple had thoroughly adopted and elaborated in his own mind the teaching of his Master, and can afford no argument for throwing doubt on the essential faithfulness of the record, and for removing all distinction between the teaching of Jesus as historically recorded by John and the latter's own personal ideas. It is, however, inherent in the nature of the

question that we should meet with the contrasts of light and darkness, and of life and death, both in the discourses of Jesus and also in the writings of John. In these ideas a fundamental view is involved, which a disciple might, indeed must, have adopted from Jesus, which, too, is generally essentially Christian in its character. We are therefore everywhere justified in affirming a Johannean system, which is distinguished from the teaching of Jesus as recorded by John.

The direct sources for the Johannean system of teaching which can be derived from the gospel, are, in the first place, the prologue (John i. 1–18), and the short conclusion (John xx. 30 f.). Next, we have certain statements which the apostle adds on his own account, especially the interpretation of some of Jesus' utterances, as in ch. ii. and vii., xi. 51 f., xii. 33; added to these, we may compare the passage in which he concludes the account of Jesus' public ministry (John xii. 37 ff.). Other passages may be adduced, but doubtfully; that in ch. ii. 24 f. must in any case be added. But in another point of view the whole gospel is of course of value for our purpose, as pointing out the events and discourses which appeared to the apostle to be of special importance, and were consequently impressed upon his memory; thus also his often brief remarks are supplemented and made clear.

The *Apocalypse* must be, in the first place, radically compared with the Gospel and Epistles of John. The line of thought on which the former is based, bears at all events a relation of essential affinity to the latter, although unmistakeable differences exist. Christology and eschatology are pre-eminently developed in the *Apocalypse*, and in regard to both these subjects it may be said to take a middle place between the systems of Paul and John. In the first place, the idea of the Logos may be found in it, but it is only applied with a special reference: Christ, as the πιστός καὶ ἀληθινός (Rev. xix. 11), who ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ κρίνει καὶ πολεμεῖ, is called ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ. With these predicates something is connected which appears to point to the atonement: He is said to be "clothed in a vesture dipped in blood." The modern view, which looks upon the Christ of the *Apocalypse* as described with an Arian or Ebionite tendency, does not allow due weight to various passages, especially those where the same divine worship is paid to Christ as to the Father (ver. 13), and Christ is called the Α and Ω (xxii. 13). If the

opinion that gives a very early origin to the Apocalypse were confirmed, it could be the more easily explained how in many respects it differs so remarkably from John's writings, and yet in many comes very close to them. The copious development of the eschatology, which goes further even than that in the Epistle to the Thessalonians, cannot be taken as any certain sign of a difference of doctrine. Added to this, throughout the whole book the question occurs, how much must be placed to the account of *form*, and what relation is borne to this by the subjectivity of the author? The more objective in its character the prophetic glance, the less are we permitted to place everything to the account of the person. If we reflect on the character of Old Testament prophecy, and on the groundwork based in the recesses of the human mind, giving rise to an intuitive view which is something different from common dreaming or meditation, we shall indeed acknowledge that the modification of the prophetic view is affected by individuality, but must also recognise the objective force as a factor therein; and a due regard to this should guide us and impose caution in the judgment to be passed on the purport of the prophecy.

§ 91. *Characteristics and Arrangement of John's System of Teaching.*

John's system of doctrine belongs in its character to the second fundamental form of apostolic teaching,—that, namely, which chiefly comprehends Christianity in its *distinction from the old covenant*. In his view, the gospel is grace and truth in Christ Jesus (John i. 17, cf. 14), and is indeed contrasted with the law given by Moses. We have therefore placed together, face to face, grace and truth and the law—Christ and Moses. His standpoint is thus denoted to be *Christological*. The peculiar character of Christianity as compared with the law is not shown by him in its effect upon men, although this is of course *implicite* involved in the idea of grace and truth, but he represents the contrast as exhibited in the persons of the authors in an objective point of view on both sides. By this view John is distinguished from Paul, who, acting in a contrary way, when he most emphatically sets forth the distinction between the two covenants, is not in the habit of referring to the personality of Christ as contrasted with a mere man such as Moses, but rather to the

subjective effects of each. John's system is, on the other hand, evidently allied, as regards this point, to the Epistle to the Hebrews, which, in the first place (ch. i. 1-3), shows the difference between the Son and the prophets, and then, from the Old Testament proving Him to be God, goes on further to base the whole peculiarity of Christianity on the special nature of Christ, who was an High Priest entirely different from that of the old covenant. The Epistle to the Hebrews thus forms a transition to John's system. But John does not polemically assert the peculiarity of Christianity as compared with the old covenant; and however significantly he may set forth the contrast between them, he appears to be in quiet possession of his views, and therefore proceeds quite simply to state their peculiarity positively, without any controversy. He takes Christ as his groundwork, and, however much he may set forth His death, he dwells upon His person more than upon His work. When he speaks of Christ, he regards Him less predominantly than Paul as the dead and risen Christ. These points are established in his system, but they are included in the person of Christ as he views it, in which he comprises everything which concerns Him. According to John i. 14, Christ Himself is full of grace and truth: it not only comes *by* Him, but is *in* Him, because He is the Only-begotten of the Father, and endowed with glory. Because he had beheld this glory in Him, he wrote the gospel which most clearly of all represents Him as *πλήρης χάριτος*. For this reason, at the beginning of his gospel he placed the prologue, in which, from the very first, he fixes his glance on Christ, and, indeed, on His divinely incarnate nature. So also in his epistle (1 John i. 1-3) he makes Christ the groundwork: everything which he announces as Christian truth is included by him in that which his eyes had seen and his hands had handled,—that is, in the person of Christ Himself. And in this point of view the Apocalypse also is genuinely Johannean, if we consider its commencement (i. 4-8), and also the messages to the churches in the three first chapters, all of which proceed upon the person of Jesus.

From this it is clear that the distinctive *character of John's system* is constituted by his assuming a theological, and not an anthropological standpoint as Paul (with the exception of the Epistle to the Colossians). He takes the principle of all life as his groundwork, and then descends to all the matters presented

to him by experience. But in his view the theological standpoint is identical with the Christological, because this very principle of life is in Christ, and the Father is known through the Son (John i. 18). This standpoint is, moreover, an objective one. The divine nature as it is in Christ is not, in the first place, considered in its communication to men; but eternal life in Christ is first regarded *per se*, although he also goes on to represent its communication to the world. Christianity could, however, be viewed in this light only after Paul's great contest against the Judaistic conception of it had been brought to a successful issue. With regard to Paul almost entirely confining his arguments derived from the Christology to the Epistle to the Colossians, we may remark that this epistle was addressed to a district near to that in which the ministry of John found its principal scene, and that it was called forth by the commencement of a system of *gnosis* which tended to alter Christianity. Similar inducements may have brought to maturity the tendency which was rooted in John's personal individuality.

It naturally results that the statements of this apostle, who more than any other takes a speculative tendency, and affords the commencement of a Christian *gnosis* corresponding to his personal character and the historical relation of his writings, bear an intuitive rather than a dialectical stamp. From the profound tranquillity of his inner life of faith there springs forth a conception of Christian truth,—a conception which rests on an intuitive contemplation, and, although entering upon the form of an idea, does not bring it out to full development. The truth appears in wide, comprehensive ideas, which, however, are not analyzed as by Paul, whose doctrine also took its rise from an inward experience. These ideas are so very comprehensive, and so deficient in strict division and limitation, that it is very difficult to exhaust them as a subject. The intuitive tendency is also a speculative one. This we can follow out not only where he enters upon the field of the divine origin of things, but also where he deals with a more practical subject, and can pursue it up to the subjective expression of the principle; the stress laid upon the idea of love certainly forming an element in this.

From this exposition of its character, we see that the development of John's teaching must be based on God, and indeed objectively,—not, therefore, on the divine fellowship, but on the

nature of God manifested in Christ. It will then treat in the first place of Christ, and through Him of the Father and the Son. It then goes on to speak of the world, and the relation borne by God to the world and mankind, both as they originally were, and as they have become. Lastly, it considers the world in its fellowship with God through Christ,—the work and result of the atonement. We shall therefore divide John's teaching into the three following main sections:—

God in Christ.

The World and Mankind.

The Fellowship of the World with God through Christ.

§ 92. *God in Christ—The Word, the Only-begotten Son.*

The idea of the Son as the *incarnate divine Word* is set forth by John in the prologue to his gospel (i. 1-18), with which we must compare the brief hints expressed in the commencement of the first Epistle (ὁ λόγος τῆς ζωῆς, 1 John i. 2), and also the λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ (Rev. xix. 13) as a mysterious name of Christ. The *idea of this Logos* must, however, be derived from the prologue to the gospel. We must of course seek to obtain our conception of it from a direct source, rather than from any history of its development outside the New Testament. Some external cause might have influenced John to make use of this designation in describing the divine nature in Christ: he might have found the Alexandrine idea of the Logos current in Asia Minor, Ephesus having then an active intercourse with Alexandria, not only of a mercantile, but also of an intellectual character. We are, however, by no means justified in supposing that John appropriated this idea in the very shape in which it prevailed in the Alexandrine Jewish philosophy, but must beforehand take the standpoint of developing out of John's connection of thought the modification of the idea of the Logos which is peculiar to him. There was a false gnosis, which was then commencing to prevail in Asia Minor, and, creeping into Christianity, sought to obtain the pre-eminence and mould it according to its own notions; this must be looked upon, even more than the Alexandrine idea of the Logos, as the inducing cause of the peculiarity of John's prologue, and the whole of his teaching as to Christ. But, on the other hand, the basis of this peculiarity lies much deeper, in the natural disposition of the apostle himself,

as we venture to imagine it, and also in the whole of his tendency to view the divine nature as the primitive existence. It was therefore not only the expression of his own personal consciousness, but also a consideration for the special needs of the times in which he lived, and the circumstances surrounding him, which guided the apostle. In the prologue, he gives the result and the quintessence of all that, as a faithful witness of Jesus, he had to relate as to His life and discourses; at the same time, he states the point of view from which they are to be regarded. The Synoptists Matthew and Luke preface their account of Christ's public appearance with a history of His earthly origin, and also with a *human* genealogy, and thus manifest the character peculiar to them of keeping to the historical side of His appearance; John, however, on the other hand, traces back Christ's appearance to that which is eternal and primordial, giving, as it were, a *divine* genealogy. For it is this divine element in Him which John chiefly seeks to depict and to adopt as his starting-point.

In giving our attention to the *purport of this prologue*, we meet with a twofold purpose in it,—to depict the divine Word, both in His nature and operation, and also in His human appearance. As regards the former, we must distinguish between the relation of the Word to God and His relation to the world. The apostle commences, “In the beginning was the Word,” *ἐν ἀρχῇ* (ver. 1). This *ἀρχῇ* is evidently something entirely different from that named in Mark i. 1, where the commencement of the gospel is simply meant. It is also not the historical beginning in contrast to the mere existence of the world, for the contrast to the world does not occur until ver. 3, and then in a much more forcible way. These words, *ἐν ἀρχῇ*, may be best compared with the *בְּרֵאשִׁית* in Gen. i. 1, creation being there compared with all temporal existence; but if this expression conveys the idea of the transition to a temporal *state of being*, John's *ἐν ἀρχῇ* is distinguished from it by carrying us to a period antecedent to all this creation (cf. John xvii. 5), and thus pointing to that which is primordial and ante-mundane. The words *πάντα ἐγένετο* (ver. 3) lead to this conclusion. The *Logos* being “in the beginning,” His relation to God is thereby declared. He is distinguished from God, for He is *πρὸς τὸν Θεόν*, *with God*, in fellowship with God. But this is also a denoting of unity; and how this unity is to be understood

follows from the words $\Theta\epsilon\delta\varsigma \eta\mu \acute{o} \lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$, $\Theta\epsilon\delta\varsigma$ being the predicate. As we may and must clearly presuppose the unity of God, the effect of these words would be, that the Logos was one with God, in that way that He might be distinguished, but not divided from God. Thus the words $\Theta\epsilon\delta\varsigma \eta\mu \acute{o} \lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ do not form an antithesis to $\acute{o} \lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma \eta\mu \pi\rho\delta\varsigma \tau\omicron\nu \Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\nu$, neither are they identical with it; they express the same idea in a more forcible and definite mode. They are, in fact, a new predicate which sets forth the distinction of persons in unity. And this unity is not to be catachrestically understood; but the more forcibly the gospel sets forth the principle of monotheism (John xvii. 3, v. 44), the more must the Logos, who, according to John, "was God," be considered as actually one with the divine essence. This idea contains, therefore, much more than the words $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\kappa\omicron\nu \Theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$.

We must now consider the relation of the Logos to the world. The existence of the world is referred to Him as the agent of creation. The word $\delta\iota\acute{\alpha}$ conveys the idea, not of the *first and original cause*, but of a causality bringing it about as an agent. The apostle is not content with this general indication of the relation of the Logos to the world, but goes on to point out how this relation is to be more definitely understood, and also to add a new element of connection. In the Logos was life (ver. 4); and being life in Himself, through Him all things might be created,—through Him, who, as the living One, might be the active cause of a life existing outside Himself. But inasmuch as life was in Him, and went from Him to the world, He was the source of life. The apostle expresses this in the words that "He was the light of men" (ver. 4). The term $\zeta\omega\eta$ conveys the idea of the general principle of life, both spiritual and bodily; in $\phi\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ this principle is more strictly defined as that which enlightens in a spiritual point of view. But we can hardly limit this idea to any particular period in man's history, and must look upon it as intended to apply generally. Ver. 4, which is closely connected with ver. 3, introduces us to the whole scope of the history of mankind. Having made its appearance among men, this light became manifest as a sanctifying principle in the midst of a dark world. It shineth in darkness (ver. 5), which is expressed as present, this light being a continuous one. This exposition, extending to the fifth verse, opens the way for that which the apostle had to state as to the appearance of Christ during his own time. On this point

he expresses himself in the first place but briefly, showing that this principle of enlightenment and sanctification had not come forth in the Baptist; and although the latter was "sent from God," yet his vocation only extended to bearing witness of the light (vers. 6-8). Next, he again goes on to follow out still further the operation of the Logos among mankind. The first point is, that the Logos had been at all times the principle of spiritual enlightenment. Another stage of the manifestation is, however, intimated in vers. 9, 10: the light came into the world, and shone in it as a true light, but also as a principle which met with opposition among men. Although He was "in the world, and the world was made by Him," nevertheless the world, which was "His own," everywhere resisted Him (vers. 10, 11); but in those who do *not* oppose Him, His nature and His efficacy are so manifested, that they, by faith in His name, became children of God, as if born of God (vers. 12, 13). And now follows the third stage of His agency. Not only does the Logos produce spiritual enlightenment among men, but He has appeared and dwelt among them, so that they could behold His glory (ver. 14 ff.). He appeared in the world in the flesh, individualized as a man. The above-named ideas constitute the train of thought which runs through the prologue, and make up the predicates which are attributed to the Logos.

The question now arises, what idea we have to form of the Logos, according to the data laid down by John? In solving this question, we must avail ourselves both of the interpretation of the term itself, and also of the historical development of the idea. The details of the prologue shut out most of the explanations of the idea which are derived from the word itself. Thus we cannot understand the Logos to mean that which is elsewhere called in the Scriptures the "word of God,"—that is, the *truth* which had been previously hidden, but is now *revealed* through Christ,—an interpretation which has been given to it both in ancient and modern times. For, according to the features developed in John's prologue, the Logos is not revealed truth, but, first and foremost, the creative principle of the world. We are also unable to look upon $\acute{o} \lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma = \acute{o} \lambda\epsilon\gamma\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ = the *promised One*. The latter even would be a forced mode of expression, and using $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ for $\lambda\epsilon\gamma\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ would be still worse. Added to this, Christ is not anywhere expressly called the "promised One." Moreover, the high conclusion

which John, in the prologue, derives from the creative agency of the Logos forbids such interpretations as Lehrer's, *ὁ λέγων τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ*, the *auctor verbi divini*, the founder of Christianity. The idea is also excluded that *λόγος* = *ὁ λέγων* = *auctor doctrinæ*,—*effectus pro efficiente* being used metaphorically. The fact of Christ being a teacher is not set forth in the prologue, except in ver. 18; and even there it is not through His word that He "declares the Father," but by His being the incarnate Logos, and as the Logos the principle of all creative and revealing divine action. But the term itself decidedly opposes any such interpretation: *λόγος* stands everywhere, not for the speaker or the teacher, but for *the matter spoken* (cf. Ps. xxxiii. 6, cxlvii. 15, 18). According to all biblical usage, God is He who speaks, and *λόγος* is that which is spoken by Him; in Philo, too, the absolute God is called *ὁ λέγων* or *λαλῶν* even in His relation to the *λόγος*, who is named the *ῥῆμα τοῦ αἰδίου*. Finally, John's description of the nature and agency of the Logos is just as little in favour of interpreting it to mean *ratio* = *reason* or *wisdom*. Although these ideas may form points in the conception of the Logos, it cannot be said of *wisdom* as a divine attribute, *Θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος*, neither is the declaration of the incarnation directly compatible with either of these explanations. Nowhere, however, in the Scriptures generally does the idea of the word (*λόγος*, *דָּבָר*) occur for the attribute of wisdom; and in this passage especially the relation expressed to *χάρις* and *ἀλήθεια* (vers. 10, 16, 17) shows that the conception of the Logos must be of a much more comprehensive nature. According to all the predicates which are here applied to it, the word Logos can be nothing else but an expression for God Himself, considered in His creative, operative, self-revealing, and communicating character. We are, moreover, led to the same conclusion, if we glance at the historical course of development of this idea, and compare it with John's conception. We have to follow the development of the idea of the Logos from its basis, rooted in the Old Testament, through the paths of apocryphal literature down to the Alexandrine *gnosis*. On Old Testament ground, the word is presented to us by the creative, operative, and thus declaratory action of God (as He who speaks). God as operating and self-revealing is sometimes represented chiefly on the side of His *power* (He speaks and it is done), sometimes on the side of His *wisdom*. The latter is forcibly set forth in Prov.

viii. and Job xxviii., and in the Apocrypha in Ecclus. xxiv. The last passage and Wisd. Sol. vii. represent both the original relation of wisdom to God, and also its operation in the world,—the latter, indeed, as a taking up its abode among men (Bar. iii. 9, 4). The wisdom which was among the Jewish nation is the law of God. Moreover, in the Book of Wisdom, as an Alexandrine work, this wisdom is not only personified, but also such attributes are applied to it, that in some passages it seems doubtful whether it is not actually looked upon hypostatically as an emanation from God. Furthermore, in addition to the wisdom, the power of God is set forth, and so set forth, that wisdom itself is called *παντοδύναμις* (vii. 23), and also the energetic divine Word is represented as appearing in the form of a person (Wisd. Sol. xviii. 15),—a form which is taken from the appearance of the destroying angel (1 Chron. xxi. 15). The way in which the illimitable operation of God is thus described sometimes by *σοφία*, and sometimes by *λόγος*, rendered it but a short step to combine the two in the word *λόγος*,—a step, too, which in the linguistic domain of the Greek language might readily be looked for. This step is taken in Philo's theory. He makes the Logos the essence of the divine power; but both His nature and relation to the absolute God are kept in such mystic obscurity, that it is difficult to decide whether an hypostasis is actually intended or not. The arguments which have been brought forward in modern times in favour of the former view can scarcely be considered as convincing. This remark applies to the predicate *ἀρχάγγελος*; for Philo applies the term *ἄγγελος* even to the divine powers which are certainly not hypostatically viewed, and, on the other hand, calls the absolute God Himself *ἀρχάγγελος*, without any idea of identifying Him with His powers. It also applies to the expression *ὁ δεύτερος Θεός*, which might apply to the absolute God Himself looked upon in another point of view.

However we may decide this question, there is in any case a great difference between the views as to the Logos held by John and Philo respectively. We see this from our inability to compare the immanent Logos of John with the immanent Logos of Philo. The appearance of the Logos in Philo corresponds to His incarnation in John; but the independence which, according to the former author, the Logos has, or appears to have, is already His property, in John's view, even prior to the incarnation. In

like manner Philo only metaphorically gives the name of *δεύτερος Θεός* to the Logos; but John calls Him *Θεός* in the strictest didactic sense, not, however, supposing two hypostases as two natures, but identifying Him with God on one side, and, on the other, distinguishing him from God. The Logos is God, as He whose person can be distinguished, who brought about the existence and life of the world. Further, instead of the physical antithesis of light and darkness, the *moral* contrast is set forth by John (John i. 5); and in connection with this, instead of Philo's docetic *ὄψις* of the divinity in the Messiah, we have in John the actual incarnation of the Word (John i. 14).

Our glance, therefore, at the historical course of development points out to us the starting-points of this doctrine even in the Old Testament; but, on comparing John's idea of the Word with the stamp of the Alexandrine doctrine of the Logos, we cannot fail to remark the decided originality of the former, which, indeed, can only be explained by an historical reference to Jesus. With the latter order of development John's teaching has but this point in common, that the Logos is the expression for the principle of the essential manifestation of God; and this historical parallel assists in setting aside the ambiguous interpretations of the idea which we before alluded to. Besides this, the predicates which are ascribed to the Logos distinguish Him so essentially, that the precise definition of the idea may be clearly gathered from the train of thought in the prologue itself. John plainly identifies the Word with God; the result therefore is that the former must be in his view something more than a divine power, and that he must rather have considered the Logos as the sum-total of all divine power (cf. ver. 14). We may now take into account the name of Logos, which is applied in the Apocalypse (xix. 13) to the self-same Person, who unites in Himself the divine powers—the *ἐπὶ πνεύματα* (iii. 1)—which are represented under the symbols of the *ἐπὶ κέρατα* and *ἐπὶ ὀφθαλμοί* (v. 6), referring both to omnipotence and omniscience. This sum-total of the divine power, which is identical with God Himself, can be neither an emanated power, nor a divine substance apart from God: it is only distinguished, but not apart from God. The Logos, in John's idea, is God as a reflection and manifestation of Him; but although reflected, He is so essentially God, that in Him all the fulness of the Godhead dwells, and nothing in it is alien to Him. The

Logos constitutes the whole element of God which is manifested in the world; and, as the reflection of God, it is He through whom the origin, continuance, and perfection of the world are brought about. With this we must compare what Jesus Himself said (John v. 26) as to His filial relation to the Father,—that the Father had given to Him to have life in Himself, but as imparted. The words *ὁ λόγος τῆς ζωῆς* (1 John i. 1) must be referred to the idea of the Logos laid down in the prologue to the gospel. Some expositors have, indeed, understood *λόγος* in this passage in its ordinary meaning of “teaching,” and have taken *the teaching as to life, with the aim of the communication of life*, as the object of that which the apostle had perceived by his senses,—which object, however, had been pre-ordained by God from the beginning of the world. Attempts have, indeed, been made to explain the words *ἦν ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς* as the commencement of the office of the apostles as teachers; but this view at once falls to the ground if we compare the parallel in the second verse, *τὴν ζωὴν τὴν αἰώνιον ἣτις ἦν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα*, etc. But the declarations *ὁ ἐώρακαμεν* and *ὁ ἀκηκόαμεν* altogether point to *a person*, considering that the personal appearance of Jesus always takes the lead in John’s fundamental view. The whole context from vers. 1–3 seems to show that in the *λόγος τῆς ζωῆς* a personal *λόγος* is intended, who is identical with the Son mentioned in ver. 3, of whom alone (as the *λόγος*) it could rightly be stated that they had seen Him. The neuter gender being used only goes to show that John desired to speak somewhat generally and indeterminate, in order the better to display the principle involved in the idea. With the exception of the prologue, this is the only passage in which the Logos is spoken of; for both from the weight of external evidence, and from the context, we are unable to consider the passage 1 John v. 7 as genuine.

In considering the further declarations which are made as to Him who is called *the Word* by John, we find it stated that “in Him was life,” indeed that He Himself was the *life*; also, that He was the *light* and the only-begotten *Son* of the Father, endowed with glory, being one with the Father. In the prologue (John i. 4) it is said, “In Him was life;” in John’s first Epistle (1 John i. 1) He is called *ὁ λόγος τῆς ζωῆς*, and in the second verse simply *ἡ ζωή*. In the first verse the two ideas are combined, and hence the necessity arose of giving an explanation of

both; and according to this, the ζῶν having been manifested, the Logos is the subject of human experience, inasmuch as they have seen the life, and preach it as that "which was with the Father" (ver. 2). The Logos is therefore the life. Life is, in John's view, a very comprehensive idea. In its proper sense it is an attribute of God, and a deeper meaning is involved when the life is transferred to men. In John v. 26 Jesus Himself represents the Father as ζῶν, having life in Himself absolutely. Nevertheless He is not directly called *the life*—a designation which is only given to the Son. The cause for this is, that the Son is the manifestation of the divine life, and is thus the source of it for us. As God is the independent living Being, from whom all real existence proceeds, so is the Logos life in Himself, although He has received it as imparted by the Father, and is the principle of life especially for mankind. All real life—the real vital energy, both spiritual and bodily—is contained in that which springs from Him. He is also called the *light* (John i. 4, 5, 9). The term "light" is, however, very generally made use of by John as a designation for the divine nature (1 John i. 5–7); it is also employed by Philo in the same way. God is looked upon as light in virtue of His spiritual existence as a self-conscious Being, who, as such, is in Himself holy and good. The Son is likewise light, inasmuch as He is life, which, being in itself intelligent and holy, communicates to the world the fulness of intelligent and holy life. In addition to these designations of *life* and *light*, the Logos is further spoken of as the "*only-begotten Son* of the Father, full of grace and truth" (John i. 14, 18, cf. iii. 16, 18; 1 John iv. 9), the word μονογενῆς not being to be understood as *dearly-loved*, but as the only one of His kind. As the manifestation of eternal life (1 John i. 1–3), which communicates itself (John i. 14–18), and leads to the Father (1 John ii. 23, cf. 22, iv. 15; 2 John ver. 9), He has brought about the perfect revelation and communication of God. He it is who was from the beginning, ὁ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς (1 John ii. 13), and is the Holy One (1 John ii. 20) and the Just (1 John i. 9, etc.), of whom the Father testifies (1 John v. 9, 10, 11). But still we are unable to prove that John plainly calls Him υἱὸς as the ἄσαρκος; neither, on the other hand, can we show that he would give Him, as the *Incarnate One*, the title of Θεός. In the passage 1 John v. 20 the ἀληθινὸς Θεὸς is more probably to be understood of the Father

(cf. John xvii. 3), although Ἰησοῦς Χριστός first precedes the οὗτος. Οὗτος, it may be observed, does not always refer to the subject immediately preceding (cf. 2 John 7, "This is a deceiver," etc.). But the Father is only understood so far as He is manifested in the Son, as Jesus Christ the Son of God is the principal subject in 1 John v. 20. This passage is, however, completed, so to speak, by that which John says in his own name in his historical narrative, where he evidently with full purpose records the exclamation of Thomas, "My Lord and my God!" (John xx. 28), thus making it the culminating point of his gospel. The narrative is carried on up to the point where this truth is recognised (cf. ver. 29).

§ 93. *The Father and the Holy Spirit.*

John does not anywhere afford us any *direct teaching as to God* in general; but wherever he speaks of God, or specially of the Father, a reference to the Son is always evident. This is the case in the prologue to his gospel, where he was of course compelled first to speak of God, with whom the Logos stood in primordial relation; but he then confines himself entirely to dwelling on the attributes of the Logos, and not until this subject is exhausted does he again revert to the Father, and even then, again with distinct reference to the Son. We find the same peculiarity existing in his first Epistle; for although, in the commencement of the latter, the Father is mentioned (ver. 2), He is only named in order to set forth the relation borne by the manifested life to the eternal God. Again, when the apostle speaks of the effects of the appearance of the Word of life, of the preaching of the Son, and of the fellowship thus founded (ver. 3), the fellowship with the Father is certainly mentioned, but it only amounts to a fellowship through the Son. It cannot be denied, that in the beginning of the next clause we find a positive theory expressed in respect to God, viz. that He is light. But still the aim of this teaching is only a practical one, and is intended to show what effect should follow the fellowship with the God who is manifested in the Son, as far as regards the framing of the human life. In the same way in ch. iii. the sanctification of Christians is referred to the purity of Christ; and even in ver. 7 of the first chapter Christ's mediation is brought in as something between the divine holiness and our sanctification. Also in the further course of the epistle

there are various characteristics of John's conception of God, which are emphatically set forth, but in every case it is the Father manifested in the Son who is the subject of his discourse, and through this manifestation is in fellowship with us. Passages such as that in 1 John v. 20 are of the same nature. In the Apocalypse also, if we compare it, Christ always seems to take the lead in the author's statement, although declarations as to God, such as those recorded in i. 4, 8, iv. 8, are not excluded.

Both in the prologue and also in the epistle the name *Θεός* is that most frequently used for God (cf. John i. 13, 18). In distinguishing Him from the Son, the idea of *Father* is also employed (thus *πατήρ*, John i. 14, 18). This God is, moreover, depicted as the *true*, the *ἀληθινός*, in contradistinction from all worship of idols (John v. 20, cf. John xvii. 3). No man hath seen Him (John i. 18; 1 John iv. 20); the Son of man alone has declared Him (John i. 18). As the *invisible God*, He is placed in contrast to men, who form a part of that which is visible, and His spiritual nature is thus called to mind (cf. Jesus' words, John iv. 24). This idea involves, that there can be no experimental view of Him, and that no one possesses any perfect intuitive perception of Him. A distinction, however, must be drawn between this idea and the passage 1 John iii. 6, where the incompatibility between any true knowledge of God and a continuance in sin is the matter in question. In the next place, this invisible God is He who is *eternal life*, having in Himself the fulness of life, and being its original source. This life is, however, also *light*, perfect and holy, and unstained by sin (1 John i. 5 ff.). *Φῶς* is a figurative expression, which may mean, generally, every kind of spiritual perfection; but, from the connection, the idea of holiness is here involved. In this conception of God as life and light, not only is the idea of God as a Spirit contained, but all the other predicates which John attributes to Him are to some extent based on it; and amongst them especially the attributes of knowing and understanding everything; also, that He is the true, faithful, and righteous God (1 John iii. 20). His omniscience is understood in its ethical relation, and consequently in its strictest sense, and naturally stands in contrast to the sin-troubled personal consciousness of man. Thus the designation of *light* involves something more than holiness, and the idea is a wider one. The Father is pure as the nature of light, but He is also the all-wise Father;

and both conceptions of Him, of His omniscience and His love, flow in equal measure from the contemplation of His nature as light. John also lays special emphasis on the conception of God as *love* (1 John iv. 8). Throughout the whole course of the epistle to the very end, the idea of love is dwelt upon: love is inculcated as the sum-total of the whole of practical Christianity. He who truly loves is born of God, and therefore, as the culmination of the line of thought, we have the idea that the nature of God is love. This idea is, however, derived from the earthly appearance of the Son, in full harmony with John's usual mode of procedure (cf. also Jesus' words, John iii. 16). The true idea of love flows, indeed, from the self-sacrifice of Christ. Love exists primarily in God, and is shown by His sending the Son. It is concerned with God's communication of Himself, and presupposes the idea of light as of moral perfection. From this idea of God His predicates naturally result,—that He is true, faithful, and just. Firstly, He is *true*, and in Him is truth. His whole work depends upon the truth that man is a sinner (1 John i. 10), and therefore God is made a liar by those who do not acknowledge this truth, and disbelieve the testimony which God has given through His Son. The ideas of faithfulness and justice are combined in ver. 9. God is *faithful* as being true to His promises, and *just* because, in conformity with His promise, He allots to every one his due. For this reason, and with reference to His promise, His faithfulness and justice involve the forgiveness of sins and the cleansing of the sinner. In 1 John iii. 20 John says that "God is greater than our heart:" the question is, whether this is meant to apply in reference to His merey or His severity. In any case, however, the remark is based upon the idea that God is omniscient. The connection with ver. 19 gives the first explanation an appearance of probability; but as those whose hearts condemn them not, who therefore have confidence in God, are not mentioned until ver. 21, the probability loses much of its force. The sign whereby we may recognise whether "we are of the truth" (ver. 19) is brotherly love. Ver. 20 might therefore form the antithesis, and say that, if our hearts condemn us, and testify that we have *not* this love, God is still greater than our hearts,—that is, how much more shall we be condemned by Him! (in this way of putting it, however, the second *ὅτι* is not without difficulty.) God is therefore greater than our

hearts, on account, in the first place, of the greater moral severity connected with His omniscience, and next, indirectly, in consequence of His perfect power of forgiving sins, and of that mercy which is in full harmony with His severity and holiness.

The first Epistle, as we have seen, lays a stress almost exclusively on the moral attributes of God which are connected with redemption; in the Apocalypse, on the other hand, the general *metaphysical attributes* of God are more set forth,—those which refer to His natural relation to the world. Thus He is the eternal Being, free from all the conditions of time (Rev. iv. 8, xi. 17), corresponding to the name of Jehovah. This attribute, according to which He fills the whole expanse of eternity, and is consequently the Immutable One, is allied to His designation as Alpha and Omega (i. 8, xxii. 13, xxi. 6). The idea of the illimitable Divine Being is also involved in the definition $\delta \Theta ε ο ς \delta \xi \omega ν$ (vii. 2, iv. 9, 10, xv. 7); and this, at all events, very much resembles John's mode of expression. Added to this, the Apocalypse displays very prominently God's power, calling Him the Creator of the world, and the Ruler over everything (v. 13, xix. 6, xx. 11, xi. 15, 17), also in many passages the *Κύριος* (i. 8. iv. 8, xi. 17, xv. 3, xxii. 5, 6, xxi. 22), and the God of heaven (xi. 13). But although this aspect of God may appear to have the preponderance, we must not necessarily conclude from this that another standpoint is taken which is different from that of John. This peculiarity of the Apocalypse may be well accounted for by its aim,—the representation of the gradual victory of Christianity. This victory is based on the idea of the universal divine rule, the effects of which are, that the dominion of Christ over the world should gradually prevail. Thus the predominance of the more general side of the conception of God is not at all out of place.

John's teaching as to the *Holy Spirit*, like his teaching as to God generally, is not of an *independent*, detailed, and complete character; he nevertheless often speaks of the Spirit (1 John iv. 2, v. 6), of the $πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας$ (iv. 6, v. 6). He always looks upon the Spirit, first of all, as the Spirit communicated to man (1 John ii. 20, iii. 24, iv. 6. 13), and all he says on the point shows clearly that he considers that this communication is brought about by the Son, following the idea expressed in John vii. 39. Therefore, with regard to this point also, he adheres to

the standpoint involved in his predominating contemplation of the Son.

§ 94. *The World and Mankind in their Original Relation to God.*

The fundamental and decisive passage which expresses John's views of the relation borne to God by the world as a whole, is contained in the commencement of the prologue to his gospel (John i. 3, 4). The principle of life in every respect, both physical and spiritual, is contained in the Logos of God. John traces back the person of the Redeemer to the earliest manifestation of God in the creation; he also refers man, the object of redemption, to the complex of all that was brought to pass in the creation. The divine principle of manifestation, and the collective existence of the world which was brought about by the former, stand in universal, absolute, and exclusive relation to one another. The Logos was not, indeed, accepted by the darkness in the world, but this rejection is a reproach to the world. It ought to have accepted Him. This close relation involves that, in spite of all the moral darkness in the world, its power of receiving divine life can never be lost, on account of the above-named absolute relation in which the world stands to the Logos.

§ 95. *The World in its Alienation from God.*

The love of the world as opposed to God in its transitoriness and vanity, forms the contrast to the love of God, and to eternal life (1 John ii. 15-17). In this sense the love of the world which God has created is forbidden, and the world, notwithstanding its creation by God, forms a contrast to Him. But in so far as the love which the world attracts is that of the world merely, and tends to a separation from God, the world is in itself vanity, and the love of it is blameable. For this love, then, becomes an attachment to fleshly lusts, and that which is merely worldly is thus opposed to God, and cannot be separated from sin.

Sin, according to 1 John iii. 4 ff., is the *transgression of the law*, the opposite to δικαιοσύνη (1 John iii. 7-10). The words ὁ ποιῶν τὴν δικαιοσύνην δίκαιός ἐστι (ver. 7) contain the explanation of the idea of ἀνομία (ver. 4). The transgression of the law by sin is overtly shown in *lying* and *unbelief*, in the ψεῦδος which is mentioned in 1 John ii. 21 f.; it is the opposition to God's truth and action, showing that the truth is not in us (1 John i.

8). We find quite the same idea expressed of *unbelief* (1 John v. 10): he who believeth not God believeth not on Him in His Son, and thus, by his contradiction of God's truth, shows openly his opposition to it (cf. v. 9, also John iii. 18). But it is also manifested by the *absence of love*, which becomes hatred to one's brother (1 John ii. 9–11, iii. 12 ff.). The latter passage points out the inward cause of the hatred which is based on alienation from God. According to 1 John iii. 10 (cf. 6 and iv. 6), and likewise because nothing but love proceeds from God (1 John iv. 16), the want of brotherly love is, as a principle, opposed to the righteousness which the law of God requires.

The sin of man, however, ultimately *blinds him*. This gives rise to the deeply influential idea of *σκοτία*, which fills such an important place in the prologue to John's Gospel, its moral root and character being most clearly expressed in 1 John ii. 11 (cf. 8, 9, 10). Hatred results in darkness, because it blinds the heart; but love keeps in the light, because it is allied to God. That is to say, darkness is nothing else but alienation from God,—an idea which may also be gathered from the passages quoted (1 John iii. 10, iv. 6, ii. 16). This darkness goes on to increase to an inward condemnation (1 John iii. 20 f.),—the self-accusation of the heart which carries with it the divine wrath, and consequently death,—the unhappy position which redemption does away with being known and felt to be death, *θάνατος* (1 John iii. 14, cf. v. 16 f., where *θάνατος* clearly appears to be the climax in the gradation of sin).

This sin is, moreover, universal among mankind: it forms among them a mode of collective life; and the latter, because its principle is a false love of the world, by which it becomes organized into a system, is called simply *the world*, *ὁ κόσμος* (cf. ii. 16, *ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου ἐστί*). It is the *κόσμος* which does not know the disciples (1 John iii. 1), indeed hates them (iii. 13), from which the enemies of Christianity take their rise, and of which they speak (1 John iv. 5). Man cannot free himself from it by his own power; without the Son he has not life, but remains in death (cf. 1 John v. 12). If we deny or undervalue this power of sin, we shall only become deeper and deeper entangled in its toils (cf. John i. 6 ff.). But this community of sin is not original among men: human sin has a mighty antecedent in the devil, the wicked one, who is the first beginner of sin, *ἀπ' ἀρχῆς* (1 John iii. 8). All who

commit sin are of him, and are seduced by him,—the murder of Abel by Cain being indeed traced back to his instigation (1 John iii. 9–12, cf. v. 18, 19); for, in the expression ὁ κόσμος κείται ἐν τῷ πονηρῷ, πονηρῷ as the masculine is doubtless to be understood as referring to the devil. Thus, with regard to this point also, John goes back to the first and highest principle, and for this reason lays so emphatic a stress in his epistle on the commencement of sin on the part of the devil.

§ 96. *The Fellowship of the World with God through Christ—The Redeemer and His Work.*

In the prologue to John's Gospel it is very clearly laid down that there was a pre-Christian agency on the part of the Logos. The Logos is generally the principle of life and light for men, and all they possess of life and light must be traced back to Him; also everything which, in the wider sphere of creation, is founded through Him. Consequently whatever amount of light and life exists in the heathen world belongs to His sphere of operation, but especially and necessarily the whole of the Old Testament dispensation. Thus, then, the province of this dispensation is called τὰ ἴδια, and the members of it οἱ ἴδιοι (John i. 11). The operation of the Logos in this province is, however, opposed by the σκοτία (ver. 5), the disposition of the world, inasmuch as the world had no knowledge of that which was divine. The Logos, therefore, has to deal with darkness in the world (ver. 5), and even His own would not receive Him (ver. 11). The law given by Moses (John i. 17) must therefore be fully brought within the sphere of operation of the Logos; and this is in perfect harmony with the way in which John, in the course of his gospel narrative (xii. 41), speaks of Isaiah, saying that he uttered his prophecy when he saw the glory (δόξα) of Jesus.

The Son of God who came into the world is the σωτήρ of the world (1 John iv. 14). As the Word made flesh, He united in His person both the truly divine and the truly human elements, and this is made the essence of the Christian confession in reference to His person (1 John iv. 2; 2 John 7; John i. 14). He is the Son who came in the flesh, the Word who became flesh, and made His abode among men so that they might see His glory. He is, moreover, without sin (1 John iii. 8), the exact opposite to sin and its representative. In that He is pure and righteous, He it is

in whom human nature and human life is sanctified and glorified so as to be a pure manifestation of God ; and for this reason so great a stress is laid on the confession that He is come in the flesh. But this comes to pass by His being the incarnate God, and therefore even in the incarnation continuing to be God, as, on the other hand, God became truly human in Him. This phenomenon, in all its grandeur, has become the subject of human experience (John i. 14 ; 1 John i. 1-3, iv, 14), and is confirmed to men by the testimony of the Father (1 John v. 6-11).

But Christ, as the incarnate Son of God, is also the *propitiation* for us (1 John ii. 2, iv. 10), whom the Father has sent into the world as the *ἵλασμός* for our sins and the sins of the whole world. He is also (1 John ii. 1) our Advocate, *παράκλητος*, with the Father (just as Jesus Himself called the Holy Ghost *another Paraclete*, who was to be substituted for Himself) ; He it is, too, in whom we have life, who is sent in order that we may live through Him (1 John iv. 9), that in Him we may have eternal life, *ζωὴ αἰώνιος* (v. 11-13, ii. 25). He is all this to us, inasmuch as He died for us (1 John iii. 16, i. 7, v. 6 f. ; John xi. 51 f., cf. iii. 16). John says (1 John iii. 16) that "He laid down His life for us ;" and, from the hortatory motive which is deduced from this fact, we may gather that this death must be looked upon as one of a beneficial character, as being intended to save others from death, and so far therefore as vicarious ; also, that it is His blood (shed in His death) which has the power of purifying from sin. The blood, together with the Spirit and water, are mentioned as forming the medium of His efficacy. John relates in his gospel that Caiaphas, led by the Spirit of God in virtue of his high-priestly office, unconsciously to himself gave utterance to the great idea that it was necessary that one man should die for the people. Through this death, therefore, did the *clearing from sin* come to pass, and was indeed so effected, that in the idea two points are involved, the expiation for sin, and the deliverance from its power and pollution, both being contained in the word *καθαρίζειν* (1 John i. 7 ff.), which points on the one hand to the Levitical expiation, and on the other, looking at the connection, clearly includes the idea of moral purification. Thus we have here all the elements of the doctrine of the atonement through Christ and His death, in regard to which a perfect

harmony exists between John's teaching and that of Paul and Peter.

John closely adheres to the historical appearance of Christ and His course of action therein, as being absolutely essential, but, above all, dwells on the inner nature of this appearance and ministry of the Lord; for the latter is nothing but the outward interposition to bring about the communication to the world of this inner nature. If we compare this plan with that of Paul, a similarity may be noticed, inasmuch as the latter, in setting forth the work of Christ, reverts to His personality, and urges the point that Christ in His new nature is the quickening Spirit (Gal. iii.; 2 Cor. iii.); but still a difference may be observed between Paul's and John's treatment of the subject. In Paul we find this set forth in the midst of an anthropological explanation, whilst John makes it his main subject, indeed the groundwork on which the whole of his doctrinal and historical statement is based: cf. the prologue to the gospel and 1 John i., in both of which we find the leading place is taken by the idea that *life*, ζωή, which is the Logos, is the principle of life for the whole world. This is not so prominently brought forward by Paul, especially in the earlier epistles, although in one passage (1 Cor. viii. 6) he states that all things are by Jesus Christ; but so completely tracing back everything to this point is an idea quite characteristic of John.

§ 97. *Fellowship with Christ, and through Him with the Father—
As regards Individuals.*

The *birth into the new life* is produced by *faith*: "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God" (1 John v. 1), and on this account has overcome the world (1 John v. 4, 5). And having the witness of truth in himself (1 John v. 10), he has through faith obtained eternal life, the ζωή αἰώνιος (1 John v. 13),—obtained it, indeed, as a present possession. Thus, therefore, the individual enters the state of salvation through faith, the positive side of this salvation being a new life in and of God, and the negative side the victory won over the world.

This state of salvation being thus produced by faith, includes all the elements of life in contrast to the previous position of sin and death. The man has become a child of God; the love of God has called him so, and the fact is now realized in him: he is τέκνον

Θεοῦ, and is permitted to have the consciousness of it (1 John iii. 1, 2, cf. ii. 29, v. 1, 4, and John i. 13). He is thus, in the first place, cleansed from all sin (1 John i. 7); his sin is taken away from him (1 John iii. 5), and he himself can and must purify himself (1 John iii. 3), being also preserved from sin (1 John v. 18). Especially, also, his sins are forgiven (1 John i. 9, ii. 12); likewise, on the other hand, the power is given of doing righteousness and of being able to keep God's commandments (1 John ii. 3, iii. 7, cf. 10, v. 3), especially of loving God and the brethren "in deed and in truth" (1 John v. 1, 2, iv. 20, 21, iii. 16-18), and consequently of knowing God (1 John iii. 6, iv. 8, v. 20, cf. ii. 20; 3 John 11). John speaks much of knowing, indeed of seeing, God; but both are made entirely conditional on moral conduct, especially on the feeling of love. And being in possession of the love of the Father (1 John iii. 1, i. 7-10, cf. ver. 6), a joyful, fearless confidence in God is finally given us (1 John iv. 17, 18), the *παρρησία* in the future day of judgment, the boldness which in the perfection of love "casteth out fear" (ii. 28, cf. iii. 19), and, moreover, gives us an assurance that our prayers will be heard (v. 14, iii. 22). We have therefore perfect joy (1 John i. 4), and the sure hope of the consummation of salvation, namely the fellowship with Christ (1 John iii. 2, 3). These passages combine to give us the sum-total of the elements of that life which is contrasted with the death of sin (1 John iii. 14), and is comprised, on the one hand, in the idea of the unction of the Spirit, τὸ χρίσμα (1 John ii. 20, 27), in virtue of which the believer is sanctified in truth and love (2 John 3), and, on the other hand, in the idea of fellowship with God, in virtue of which the believer, as being in the Son, is and abides in the Father also, as the Father in Him (1 John ii. 24, i. 3, iv. 12, v. 20).

But although in *this position of the believer the dominion of sin* is done away with, it cannot be said that every sinful emotion and action is thereby excluded; and man must therefore, even when in a position of faith, retain the consolation of the propitiation (1 John ii. 1, 2). Jesus is the Advocate for the sins into which even believers may perhaps fall (cf. ch. iii. 19): they cannot fail to be preserved through the fellowship with Christ, which is made certain to them by the consciousness that they have received the Spirit (1 John iii. 24). For this Spirit is the very

Spirit of Jesus, of whose fulness He has Himself imparted to us (1 John iv. 13). Believers are, moreover, preserved from sin by the power of constantly purifying themselves (1 John iii. 3), and of keeping themselves so that "that wicked one toucheth them not" (1 John v. 18, iii. 9, ii. 13, 14); for this immunity from the attacks of the evil one constitutes the chief victory over sin, and the freedom from its dominion. He that is born again—and this is the fundamental idea of the whole matter—does not depend merely on his own actions; for the remnant of sin that is left continues to exercise such power, that he is compelled again and again to have recourse to the Advocate, who has indeed become the propitiation for our sins and the sins of the whole world.

If, in our consideration of John's line of teaching as to the personal salvation of individuals, we compare it with Paul's doctrine, we shall observe that John, on the one hand, makes the great principle of faith the first requisite in the new life of men; also, on the other hand, that in his view this new life never becomes a personal righteousness, but is always dependent on, and communicated by, Christ. The elements of the Pauline doctrine of justification are similar in their nature. If John had been compelled to answer the question, By what means men are justified? the only reply he could have given would have been, By faith. But, at the same time, this faith is in his view merely the principle of the new life in good works. It does not, however, enter into the Johannean sphere of thought, when he is considering the idea of subjective atonement, to make that distinction between justification and the new life which would understand the former to be an alteration in the relation to God, and the latter a change in the life itself, although both are brought about by faith, and thus become one. This dialectical distinction, which we find in Paul's remarks on the subject, is not made use of by John; it was not possible, looking at his intuitive mode of procedure. We have in his writings a broad view of the faith by which the world is overcome, in which view all these aspects are included, but only as diverse aspects of the same life established by God, and born of Him. All the principles of the doctrine of justification are to be found in the apostle's statement, and the latter may justly be looked upon as fully agreeing to them; but the above-named question, as we have put it, is not plainly adopted or answered by John. The chief point of agreement

with Paul is, that the latter also looks upon faith as the great principle with which the whole plan of salvation is bound up. Paul, indeed, with regard to this subject, has still more grandly elaborated his view of faith, and has displayed it in all its richness.

§ 98. *Fellowship with Christ, and, through Him, with the Father*
—*Its Effects on the Collective Life of Believers.*

The knowledge of Christ, and fellowship with God in His nature of light, are the means of producing the *κοινωνία μετ' ἀλλήλων* (1 John i. 3, 7). *Believers*, because they are believers, have become *brethren* in a higher sense of the term, in virtue of being joint partakers in the new birth from God (cf. 1 John iv. 20, 21, with v. 1, 2; and as to the idea of ἀδελφός generally, cf. 1 John ii. 9, 11, iii. 11–18, v. 16; 3 John 5, 10). It is the power of love (1 John iii. 16–18, v. 16; cf. 2 John 10 f. and 3 John v. 10), and of a right confession of faith (1 John ii. 23, iv. 2, cf. 3; 2 John 7, 9–11), which causes this fellowship to be both inward and outward; and thus those who are associated together in one place join together to form a Church (ἐκκλησία, 3 John 6, 9). The fellowship itself is always called *κοινωνία*; and the ἐκκλησία is merely the local community, in which meaning the word occurs in John's third Epistle.

This fellowship of believers forms, moreover, a contrast to the world as the whole body of unbelievers subject to death, including also those of heterodox views, among whom false prophets and antichrists are specially mentioned as seducers (1 John iv. 1–6, ii. 18, 22, 26; 2 John 7). Against these it is necessary for believers to be on their guard, by trying the spirits whether they be of God (1 John iv. 1, 2, 6), and also by strictly abstaining from any participation in their wicked course of action (2 John 8, 10, 11, cf. 7, and 3 John 11). But, on the other hand, believers are to be of good courage in the face of these adversaries, knowing that they have already overcome them in virtue of their fellowship with Christ, “who is greater than he that is in the world” (1 John iv. 4; he who is in the world is the *πονηρός*, 1 John v. 18, 19, iii. 8–12). Being in possession of the anointing received of God, they are entirely independent as regards the knowledge to be derived from these seducers (1 John ii. 27, cf. ver. 26). They need no teaching from without, having the truth

in themselves ; and for this very reason are secured against any seduction of false doctrine. The world is so entirely opposed to real believers and their fellowship, that it may be plainly said of it that "the world knoweth them not" (1 John iii. 1) : they are completely alienated the one from the other. On this account the children of God are objects of hatred on the part of the world (1 John iii. 13).

But the fact that seducers, false prophets, and antichrists are all included together in the conception of *the world*, shows that the latter is not to be sought for among unbelievers only, but that it has its members even in the community itself, within which, therefore, a contrast is brought about. And this contrast is not merely one of false doctrine as compared with the true faith ; but, as the latter is always combined with righteousness, and unbelief with sin, John, in tracing back to its origin the spirit of the world existing within the Christian community, finds the root of it in sin. Indeed, even among the brethren (1 John v. 16, 17), consequently as existing within the Church, a sin is mentioned which "is unto death." Whosoever is burdened with this sin belongs to the world, although he may externally be numbered among believers : he is absolutely severed from their inward fellowship and entire sphere of life,—so much so, indeed, that they can no longer pray for him with a hope that their prayer will be granted. The "sin unto death" is doubtless the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, by which the germ of divine life is radically expelled from the man committing it ; it is therefore a sin which cannot be forgiven. With this we should compare the passage in John's Gospel (ch. xii. 40), where he speaks of the hardening of the heart as being well deserved, and as being the cause of the persistent and invincible unbelief of the Jews.

§ 99. *Consummation of the Fellowship with Christ, both for Individuals and the Church.*

Because this fellowship, as it now exists at the time being, is life with God through Christ, it is even already eternal life ; but there is nevertheless a consummation of it impending in the future (1 John iii. 2). This will consist in a perfected assimilation to, and fellowship with, Christ : the "full reward" of that which is good will then be realized (2 John 8). The advent of this consummation is placed in connection with the last appear-

ance of Christ (1 John ii. 28 : ὅταν φανερωθῇ . . . ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ αὐτοῦ), which will be also the day of judgment (1 John iv. 17). This future is therefore, as far as regards believers, a subject of joyful and confident hope. John has not given us any detailed description of the nature and mode of this consummation ; but, in his belief on the point, he probably adhered to the discourses of the Lord which he has himself handed down to us with regard to this subject ; cf. John v. and the teaching therein contained as to the twofold resurrection, the ἀνάστασις ζωῆς, and the ἀνάστασις κρίσεως.

This consummation is, however, preceded by a peculiar course of development of the Christian community, before the expiration of which the spirit of antichrist must appear within the Church (1 John iv. 3 ; cf. 2 John 7), and must also be overcome (cf. ver. 4). Its appearance is looked upon as something necessary, and has been long recognised in that light. John states, indeed, that this spirit already exists in the world. This spirit of antichrist is not the spirit of the world generally in contrast to the kingdom of God ; it is rather to be considered as a distinct opposition to Christ which makes its appearance within the Church itself, and, assuming the outward show of Christianity, places itself in a position of the most decided resistance to true Christianity. This spirit was even then at work in the world ; there were already many antichrists (2 John 7). But these passages do not exclude the idea of the concentration of the spirit of antichrist in one distinct individuality, to take place at some future time (cf. 2 Thess. ii. 4).

§ 100. *Conclusion.*

In the doctrinal system of John, the line of apostolical teaching comes to its conclusion in a development of doctrine carried to its highest point,—a development which concentrates everything in the person of Christ, and at the same time realizes to the greatest extent the course of instruction which all the apostles followed out in common.

The various apostolical systems form an organically connected and gradually progressive cycle of doctrinal development ; in John's system the whole of Christianity is traced back to the person of Christ,—this subject being treated with a high degree of amplification. The teaching as to Christ rises, therefore, in his

method, to the most precise consciousness of His Godhead. But even in those apostolical systems which content themselves with a somewhat lower stage of development with regard to this point, the germ of the doctrine which is so much more fully set forth by John may be clearly perceived.

The elements possessed in common by all the apostolical systems of teaching were (cf. § 53) the doctrines of the person of Jesus Christ, that He was the Lord; and of the salvation and life that were brought about by Him in opposition to the sin and corruption of the world; and also of the consummation of this salvation and life at some future time. These doctrines are the foundation pillars of apostolical teaching; and these are the very ideas which, with a decided reference to the superiority of the new covenant over the old dispensation, are fully realized in John's system by the grand view which he takes of Christ as the manifested Word of God, and of the faith which hath overcome the world.

INDEX.

- ABRAHAM, 339, 455 ff.
 Accommodation to circumstances, or compromise, 65, 92, 193.
 Acts of the Apostles, 271, 513.
 Adam, 51, 441 ff.
 Alexandrinism, 525.
 Allegory, 66.
 Ananias, 303.
 Angels, as mentioned in the history, 35, 54; teaching as to, 248, 372, 458, 507, 515.
 Anna, 36.
 Anthropology. *See* Man.
 Antioch, 298, 300, 308 ff.
 Apocalypse. *See* John.
 Apocrypha of the New Testament, 15, 270.
 Apostles, their characteristics, vocation, and life, 152, 273, 285, 288, 320, 332.
 Apostolic epistles, 6, 270.
 Apostolic council, 311.
 Apostolical doctrine, 331, 334.
 Apostolical fathers, 272.
 Apostolic age, 270, 290.
 Arabia, 307.
 Ascension. *See* Jesus.
 Ascetic school, the, 317.
 Atonement, the. *See* Jesus' work.
 Attributes, the divine. *See* God.
 Augustine, 442.
 Augustus, 34.

 BAPTISM, 253, 404.
 Baptism, infant, 254.
 Baptize, command to, 161.
 Barnabas, 300, 308 ff., 312 f.
 Baur, 419.
 Bethlehem, 34 f.
 Biblical theology, its idea, 1; interest, 3; method, 7.
 Biography of Jesus, 25.
 Bishops, 321.
 Brethren of the Lord, 342, 362.

 CAIAPHAS, 82.
 Calling of believers, 228, 494.
 Candace, 298.
 Capernaum, 60.
 Celsus, 27.
 Census at the birth of Jesus, 34 f.
 Christianity, as life and doctrine, 10; its spread, 264, 297 f., 309; its world-wide influence, 285; in the view of the Apostle James, 344; Peter, 376; Paul, 422; the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, 517.
 Christian, the name of, 308.
 Christmas, feast of, 26.
 Christology and Christ. *See* Jesus.
 Chronology of the life of Jesus, 59.
 Church, the, 244, 259, 319, 408, 507.
 Clement of Rome, 272, 338.
 Community of Christians, the, 359, 408, 505, 545.
 Conscience, the, 175, 401, 415.
 Consummation of all things, the, 242, 265, 268, 357, 377, 407, 504, 509, 546.
 Conversion, 233, 355, 404, 500 f.
 Cornelius, 299.
 Creation, the, 454, 461, 511, 533.
 Credner, 342, 368, 418.

 DAMASCUS, 303.
 Deacons, 295, 320.
 Death, 182, 354, 436.
 Death of Jesus. *See* Jesus.
 Demoniac. *See* Possessed by Satan.
 Demons. *See* Satan.
 Didactic stories, 67.
 Disciples of Jesus, 61.
 Dogmatics, 2.
 Dorner, 266.

 EBIONITES, the, 27, 32, 46, 341, 399.
 Eichhorn, 418.
 Egypt, flight of Jesus into, 37.
 Election, 230, 407, 460, 463, 492.
 Elias, 39, 44.
 Elymas, 318.
 End of the World. *See* Consummation, etc.
 Epiphany, feast of, 26.
 Essenes, the, 58, 317, 360.
 Eternity. *See* Consummation of all things.
 Eusebius, 338, 368, 417.

Evangelists, the, 3, 15-22.

Evil, 181.

Exegesis, 2.

FAITH, 235, 329, 344, 356, 403, 415, 426, 491, 518, 542.

Father. *See* God.

False teachers in apostolical times, 363, 368, 421, 525.

Flesh or *σάρξ*, 180, 353, 401, 445, 448.

GALILEE, 59.

Gamaliel, 294, 296.

Genealogy of Jesus, 33.

Gentiles, reception into the Church, 298, 307, 309 f.

Gifts, apostolical, 288, 321.

Gnome, the, 66.

Gnostic school, the, 421.

God, idea of, in the Old Testament, 94-96; in the New Testament, 94-98, 344, 350, 397, 512, 533.

Gospel of Jesus, the, 90.

Guilt of man. *See* Sin.

HEART, the. *See* Man.

Heathenism, origin and guiltiness of, 435, 450; in contest with Christianity, 319.

Hebrews, Epistle to the, 315, 328, 417, 513.

Hegesippus, 341.

Hellenists, the, 295, 298.

Herder, 341.

Hermas, 338.

Herod the Great, 37.

Herod Antipas, 43.

Hope in man, 350, 469.

INSPIRATION, 24, 333.

Immortality of man, 174.

Irenæus, 283.

Israel's overthrow and rejection, 203, 247, 263, 372, 493 f.

JAMES, the brother of the Lord, 290, 301, 312, 337, 338, 363, 368, 409.

James, the Epistle of, 338.

Jerusalem, the Church at, 292, 295, 340, 362.

Jerusalem, sojourn of Jesus at, 60.

Jesus, the person of: His divinity, 108, 117, 137, 371, 381, 388, 469, 514, 525; His pre-existence, 122, 124, 126, 139, 205, 382, 471, 473, 476, 526; the world created through Him, 462, 514, 538; His positions, 384, 478; humiliation, 221, 471; agency in the old dispensation, 381, 470; manhood, 136, 514; He is the Son of man, 108; the second Adam, 466; the Spirit, 46, 148, 384, 470; soul and body, 137, 383, 468;

His birth, 29; childhood, 36; growth, 38, 46; chief facts of His life, 21; His Messiahship, 52, 73, 199; vocation, 205; teaching, 62, 90, 206; actions, 71; plan, 51, 54, 57, 73; sinlessness, 132, 385, 469; divine attestation, 131, 208, 384; sufferings and death, 81, 209, 385, 390, 539; resurrection, 86, 274, 386, 486; ascension, 86, 274, 352, 386, 478; second coming, 134, 221, 268, 344, 396, 510, 547.

Jesus, the work of: His threefold office, 223; ministry, 59, 207, 223, 389, 479; as a model, 390; His high-priestly office, 134, 209, 392, 480, 484, 541; descent into Hades, 387, 393; and ministry in heaven, 149, 221, 395, 487.

Jewish-Christians, 292, 310, 316, 339, 350, 368, 421.

John the Baptist, 39, 146.

John, disciples of, 41.

John, the Apostle, 290, 301, 336, 519.

John, the Gospel of, 3, 19, 520.

John, the Epistle of, 519.

John, the Revelation of, 521, 531.

Joseph, 27 ff., 30.

Josephus, 22, 43, 294, 341.

Judas Iscariot, 62, 83.

Jude the brother of the Lord, and his Epistle, 368.

Judgment, the divine, 225, 267, 352, 354, 371, 396, 414, 436, 453.

Justification, 240, 345, 406, 409, 495, 513, 544.

Justin Martyr, 27, 31, 288.

KERN, 341, 418.

Kingdom of God, the, in the Old Testament, 263; in the New Testament, 92, 110, 331, 408, 507.

Kostlin, 360.

LACHMANN, 218.

Law, the, 73, 201, 316, 335, 348, 357, 366, 374, 449, 457, 499.

Libertinism among Christians, Gentile, 318, 369.

Life, divine, true, and heavenly, 97, 226, 242, 269, 326 f., 427, 432.

Longsuffering of God, 453.

Logos, the, 31, 47, 136, 170, 372, 525, 538, 540.

Lord's Supper, the, 212 ff., 254, 506.

Love, 239, 240, 251, 284, 329, 357, 407, 501, 543.

Luke, 271 f.

Luke, the Gospel of, 19, 27.

Lutz, 155, 165.

MAGIC, 318.

- Magi, the, 36 f.
 Man, teaching as to, in the Old Testament, 186; in the New Testament, 173, 353, 401, 440, 449.
 Manifestation of God in His works, 435, 454.
 Marcion, 27.
 Mark, the Gospel of, 18, 412.
 Mary, the Virgin, 27, 30.
 Matthew, the Gospel of, 18, 363, 412.
 Matthias, 301.
 Means of grace, 253, 506.
 Melchizedek, 224.
 Messiah in Old Testament, the, 116, 141.
 Meyerhoff, 419.
 Michael the archangel, 373.
 Miracles of Jesus, 23, 76, 206, 208; of the apostles, 287.
 Montanism, 283, 322.
 Moses, 373, 455.

 NATHANAEL, 61.
 Nazarenes, 308.
 Nazareth, 28, 34, 37.
 Nicodemus, 58.
 Nicolas, 295.
 Noah and his sons, 393, 404.

 OATHS, 360.
 Offences or scandal caused, 187.
 Old Testament, the. *See* Testament.
 Olshausen, 117, 235.
 Origen, 27, 218, 288, 373.
 Original sin, 183, 186, 355, 401, 436, 440.

 PARABLES, 66 f.
 Paraclete, the, 148, 152.
 Passion of Jesus. *See* Jesus.
 Paul's epistles, 418.
 Paul, 4, 290, 299, 302-314, 325, 335, 410, 427, 542.
 Peace, 498, 504.
 Pelt, 418.
 Pentecost, 275.
 Peter, 4, 53, 61, 290, 299, 301, 312, 335, 410.
 Peter, First Epistle of, 374.
 Peter, Second Epistle of, 315, 375, 413.
 Pharisees, the, 293, 316, 421.
 Philip, 298.
 Philo, 279, 530.
 Polycarp, 272.
 Possession, satanic, 192.
 Power of the keys, the so-called, 154.
 Prayer, 339; Jesus' high-priestly prayer, 84.
 Pre-existence. *See* Jesus.
 Predestination, 228, 460.
 Presbyter, 321.

 Primitive Christianity in the New Testament, 9.
 Prologue to John's Gospel, 526.
 Prophecy, 202.
 Proselytes, baptism of Jewish, 40.

 QUIRINIUS, 35.


 RATIONALISM, 70.
 Reason, 70.
 Redeemer, the, and redemption, 170, 186, 195, 204, 356, 389, 453, 460, 463, 479.
 Religion, Christian and non-Christian, 9.
 Regeneration, 151, 231, 331, 356, 406, 542.
 Repentance, 234, 356, 404, 502.
 Restitution of all things, the, 269, 518.
 Resurrection of Jesus. *See* Jesus.
 Resurrection of the dead, 222, 269, 511.
 Revelation, idea of New Testament, 13.
 Revelations made to Paul, 429.
 Righteousness, 240, 415, 423, 427, 430, 491.

 SABBATH, the, 72, 129, 203.
 Sacrificial idea. *See* Jesus' work.
 Sadducees, the, 293.
 Salvation, 90, 226, 326, 345, 370, 377, 414, 490.
 Salvation, ordering of, 228, 407, 495.
 Sanctification, 240, 356, 407, 500, 503, 543.
 Satan and his kingdom, in the Old Testament, 189; in the New Testament, 189, 225, 355, 402, 453, 508, 540.
 Schleiermacher, 30, 112, 128, 418.
 Schmidt, E. C., 418.
 Schneckenburger, 339.
 Schwegler, 341, 374, 419.
 Secret society, hypothesis of Jesus forming a, 58.
 Sermon on the Mount, the, 94, 364 ff.
 Serpent in the wilderness, the, 215.
 Servant of God, the (in the Old Testament), 116.
 Silas, 309.
 Simeon, 36.
 Simon Magus, 318.
 Sin, in the Old Testament, 178; in the New Testament, 179, 353, 400, 436, 439, 538.
 Sin against the Holy Ghost, the, 158.
 Sins, forgiveness of, 212, 236, 405, 498.
 Sinlessness. *See* Jesus.
 Social effects of Christianity, 286.
 Son of God. *See* Jesus.
 Son of man. *See* Jesus.
 Sonship of man to God, 101, 233, 237, 504.
 Soul. *See* Man.

- Spirit, the Holy, in the Old Testament, 96, 145, 169; in the New Testament, 146, 151, 152, 153, 161, 163, 167, 351, 371, 399, 416, 424, 470, 487, 503, 537.
- Star of the wise men, 37.
- Stephen, 295, 302.
- Strauss, 3, 28, 118, 128, 139, 200, 266.
- Syncretism, Gentile, 319.
- Synoptists, the, 3.
- TARSUS, 308.
- Teaching of Jesus and the apostles, 4, 331.
- Temple. *See* Israel.
- Temple, Jesus' youthful visit to the, 38.
- Temptation of Jesus, the, 47, 191.
- Testament, Old and New, 328, 335, 360, 379, 413, 424, 515.
- Theosophical tendencies, 317, 421.
- Timothy, 399.
- Tongues, speaking with, 276, 280, 321.
- Trinity, the, 161, 169, 399, 512.
- UNBELIEF, 180.
- Universality of Christianity, as taught by Jesus, 56, 204, 264; as taught by the apostles, 279, 294, 319, 333.
- Usteri, 419.
- WIESELER, 342.
- Wisdom, 357.
- Wisdom of God, the, 170, 529.
- Word of God, the, 253, 260.
- World, the, 187, 259, 331, 355, 454, 528, 545.
- World, the renewal of the, 415.
- Works, 357, 499.
- Wrath of God, 436, 453.
- ZELLER, 468.
- Zwinglius, 256.

THE END.

Handwritten signature



1 1012 01125 6635

Date Due

Ja 5 '48

10 '48

F 8 '48

N 30 '48

D 18 '49

F 7 '46

Mr 11 '46

Ja 28 '48

JA 30 '50

FE 13 '50

JA 23 '51

FE 6 '51

OC 20 '52

OC 21 '52

MAY 2 '84

MAY 2 '84

DEC 2 1997



